

# From K.A.M. Tori to Isospectral Invariants and Spectral Rigidity of Billiard Tables.

G.Popov, P.Topalov

February 10, 2016

## Abstract

This article is a part of a project investigating the relationship between the dynamics of completely integrable or “close” to completely integrable billiard tables, the integral geometry on them, and the spectrum of the corresponding Laplace-Beltrami operators. It is concerned with new isospectral invariants and with the spectral rigidity problem for the Laplace-Beltrami operators  $\Delta_t$ ,  $t \in [0, 1]$ , with Dirichlet, Neumann or Robin boundary conditions, associated with  $C^1$  families of billiard tables  $(X, g_t)$ . We introduce a notion of weak isospectrality for such deformations. The main dynamical assumption on  $(X, g_0)$  is that the corresponding billiard ball map  $B_t$  or an iterate  $P_t = B_t^m$  of it posses a Kronecker invariant torus with a Diophantine frequency  $\omega_0$  and that the corresponding Birkhoff Normal Form is nondegenerate in Kolmogorov sense. Then we prove that there exists  $\delta_0 > 0$  and a set  $\Xi$  of Diophantine frequencies containing  $\omega_0$  and of full Lebesgue measure around  $\omega_0$  such that for each  $\omega \in \Xi$  and  $0 < \delta < \delta_0$  there exists a  $C^1$  family of Kronecker tori  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$ ,  $t \in [0, \delta]$ . If the family  $\Delta_t$ ,  $t \in [0, 1]$ , satisfies the weak isospectral condition we prove that the average action  $\beta_t(\omega)$  on  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$  and the Birkhoff Normal Form of  $P_t$  at  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$  are independent of  $t \in [0, \delta]$  for each  $\omega \in \Xi$ . As an application we obtain infinitesimal spectral rigidity for Liouville billiard tables in dimensions 2 and 3. In particular infinitesimal spectral rigidity for the ellipse and the ellipsoid is obtained under the weak isospectral condition. Applications are obtained also for strictly convex billiard tables in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  as well as in the case when  $(X, g_0)$  admits an elliptic periodic billiard trajectory with no resonances of order  $\leq 4$ . The results are based on a construction of  $C^1$  families of quasi-modes associated with the Kronecker tori  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$  and on suitable K.A.M. theorems for  $C^1$  families of Hamiltonians.

## Contents

|          |                                                                     |           |
|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>Introduction</b>                                                 | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>I</b> | <b>Isospectral invariants and rigidity</b>                          | <b>16</b> |
| <b>2</b> | <b>Main Results</b>                                                 | <b>16</b> |
| 2.1      | Billiard ball map . . . . .                                         | 16        |
| 2.2      | Main Results . . . . .                                              | 17        |
| 2.3      | Proof of Theorem 3 . . . . .                                        | 19        |
| <b>3</b> | <b>Infinitesimal spectral rigidity of Liouville billiard tables</b> | <b>20</b> |

|           |                                                                                                          |            |
|-----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| <b>4</b>  | <b>Isospectral deformations in the presence of elliptic geodesics.</b>                                   | <b>24</b>  |
| <b>5</b>  | <b>Isospectral deformation of locally strictly geodesically convex billiard tables of dimension two.</b> | <b>33</b>  |
| <b>6</b>  | <b>Birkhoff Normal Forms of <math>C^1</math> deformations.</b>                                           | <b>42</b>  |
| <b>7</b>  | <b>Microlocal Birkhoff Normal Form of the monodromy operator</b>                                         | <b>45</b>  |
| 7.1       | $C^1$ families of PDOs and FIOs with a large parameter $\lambda$ . . . . .                               | 46         |
| 7.1.1     | $C^1$ families of symbols and $\lambda$ -PDOs . . . . .                                                  | 46         |
| 7.1.2     | $C^1$ families of $\lambda$ -FIOs. . . . .                                                               | 47         |
| 7.1.3     | Quantization of $C^1$ families of billiard ball maps. . . . .                                            | 50         |
| 7.2       | Reduction to the boundary . . . . .                                                                      | 58         |
| 7.3       | Quantum Birkhoff Normal Form . . . . .                                                                   | 61         |
| <b>8</b>  | <b><math>C^1</math> families of quasi-modes and iso-spectral invariants</b>                              | <b>70</b>  |
| 8.1       | Quantization condition . . . . .                                                                         | 70         |
| 8.2       | Construction of $C^1$ families of quasi-modes . . . . .                                                  | 71         |
| 8.3       | From quasi-modes to isospectral invariants . . . . .                                                     | 74         |
| <b>II</b> | <b>K.A.M. theorems and Birkhoff Normal Forms</b>                                                         | <b>77</b>  |
| <b>9</b>  | <b>K.A.M. theorems</b>                                                                                   | <b>77</b>  |
| 9.1       | K.A.M. theorems for $C^k$ families of Hamiltonians . . . . .                                             | 78         |
| 9.2       | K.A.M. theorem with parameters for symplectic maps . . . . .                                             | 84         |
| 9.3       | K.A.M. theorems for $C^k$ families of symplectic maps . . . . .                                          | 89         |
| 9.4       | Birkhoff Normal Forms for $C^k$ -families of symplectic maps . . . . .                                   | 93         |
| <b>10</b> | <b>KAM theorem with parameters</b>                                                                       | <b>101</b> |
| <b>11</b> | <b>Proof of Theorem 10.1</b>                                                                             | <b>104</b> |
| 11.1      | <i>The KAM Step</i> . . . . .                                                                            | 104        |
| 11.1.1    | <i>The KAM Lemma</i> . . . . .                                                                           | 104        |
| 11.1.2    | <i>Preparing the next iteration.</i> . . . .                                                             | 111        |
| 11.2      | Iteration . . . . .                                                                                      | 113        |
| 11.3      | Proof of (i) . . . . .                                                                                   | 121        |
| 11.4      | Inverse Approximate Lemma and proof of (ii) . . . . .                                                    | 121        |
| <b>A</b>  | <b>Appendix.</b>                                                                                         | <b>125</b> |
| A.1       | Approximation Lemma . . . . .                                                                            | 125        |
| A.2       | Higher order Hölder estimates of a composition and of the inverse function. . . . .                      | 127        |
| A.2.1     | Estimates of the composition and the inverse function. . . . .                                           | 127        |
| A.2.2     | Interpolation inequalities. . . . .                                                                      | 130        |
| A.2.3     | Weighted Hölder norms and interpolation inequalities. . . . .                                            | 132        |
| A.2.4     | Symplectic transformations and generating functions. . . . .                                             | 134        |
| A.3       | Whitney Extension Theorem . . . . .                                                                      | 137        |

## 1 Introduction

This article is a part of a project (cf. [53]-[56]) investigating the relationship between the dynamics of completely integrable or “close” to completely integrable billiard tables, the integral geometry on them, and the spectrum of the corresponding Laplace-Beltrami operators. It is concerned with new isospectral invariants and the spectral rigidity of the Laplace-Beltrami operator associated with  $C^1$  deformations  $(X, g_t)$ ,  $0 \leq t \leq 1$ , of a billiard table  $(X, g)$ , where  $X$  is a  $C^\infty$  smooth compact manifold with a connected boundary  $\Gamma := \partial X$  of dimension  $\dim X = n \geq 2$  and  $t \rightarrow g_t$  is a  $C^1$  family of smooth Riemannian metric on  $X$ .

Substantial progress in the inverse spectral geometry has been made by means of the wave-trace formula [13], [15], [27, 28], [39], [66]-[70], and by its semi-classical analogue - the Gutzwiller trace formula [40], [27, 28], [17, 18]. The wave-trace formula, known in physics as the Balian-Bloch formula and treated rigorously by Y. Colin de Verdière [5], J. Duistermaat and V. Guillemin [11], V. Guillemin and R. Melrose [16] and S. Zelditch [69] (see also [6], [39], [49], [57], [58]), as well as the Gutzwiller trace formula relate the spectrum of the operator with certain invariants of the corresponding closed geodesics such as their lengths and the spectrum of the linear Poincaré map.

It has been proved in [13], [66, 67], [27, 28], that for certain nondegenerate closed geodesics one can extract the Birkhoff Normal Form (BNF) from the singularity expansions of the wave-trace. S. Zelditch [68] - [71] and H. Hezari and S. Zelditch [21] have reconstructed the boundary for a large class of analytic domains on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  having certain symmetries. Hezari and Zelditch [22] have proven infinitesimal rigidity of isospectral deformations of the ellipse.

Spectral rigidity of closed Riemannian manifolds of negative sectional curvature has been obtained by V. Guillemin and D. Kazhdan [14] (in dimension two), C. Croke and V. Sharafutdinov [7] (in any dimension) and by G. Paternain, M. Salo, and G. Uhlmann [45] for closed oriented Anosov surfaces. In order to link the spectrum of the Laplace-Beltrami operator with the length spectrum of the manifold the wave-trace formula is used. The wave-trace formula is especially useful for  $C^1$ -deformations  $(X, g_t)$  of a closed Riemannian manifold  $(X, g_0)$  with an Anosov geodesic flow since every closed geodesic of  $(X, g_0)$  is hyperbolic, hence, nondegenerate and it gives rise to a  $C^1$  family of closed hyperbolic geodesics of  $(X, g_t)$  for  $|t|$  small enough. This reduces the problem of the infinitesimal spectral rigidity of Anosov manifolds to the injectivity of a geodesic ray transform which has been proved for negatively curved closed manifolds of any dimension [7] and for closed oriented Anosov surfaces [45]. Moreover, infinitesimal rigidity implies spectral rigidity because of the structural stability. None of these properties is valid for deformations of a billiard table “close” to an integrable billiard table which makes the spectral rigidity problem much more difficult in that case. The wave-trace method requires certain technical assumptions such as simplicity of the length spectrum (a non-coincidence condition) and non-degeneracy of the corresponding closed geodesic and its iterates which are not fulfilled in general.

The main dynamical assumption on  $(X, g_0)$  in the present work is that the corresponding billiard ball map or an iterate of it possesses a Kronecker invariant torus (see Definition 1.1) with a Diophantine frequency vector and that the corresponding Birkhoff Normal Form (BNF) is

nondegenerate in a Kolmogorov sense. Such Hamiltonian systems are said to be of Kolmogorov-Arnold-Moser (K.A.M.) type. The dynamics of such systems is quite complex. In particular, the non-coincidence and the non-degeneracy conditions may not hold for the corresponding closed geodesics. This makes the wave-trace method useless for such systems in general. On the other hand, the Kronecker tori with Diophantine frequencies survive under small perturbations which makes them the right objects to look for. For this reason we propose another method which is based on the construction of  $C^1$ -families of quasi-modes associated with these tori.

Du to the Kolmogorov-Arnold-Moser (K.A.M.) theory, if the initial Hamiltonian system ( $t = 0$ ) is completely integrable and if it satisfies the Kolmogorov non-degeneracy condition, then a large part of the invariant tori of the initial system having Diophantine frequencies  $\omega$  survive under the perturbation for  $t$  in a small interval  $[0, \delta_0)$  and give rise to cylinders of invariant tori  $t \rightarrow \Lambda_t(\omega)$ ,  $0 \leq t < \delta_0$ . The positive number  $\delta_0$  depends on the small constant  $\kappa$  and on the exponent  $\tau$  in the Diophantine condition (1.2). The aim of this paper is to prove that the invariant tori form  $C^1$ -families with respect to  $t$  and that the value at  $\omega$  of the corresponding Mather's  $\beta$ -functions does not depend on  $t$ , or equivalently that the Birkhoff Normal Form (BNF) of the system at each torus  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$  does not depend on  $t$ . Applications will be obtained in the following three cases: for deformations of Liouville billiard tables, in the case of deformations of strictly convex domains and in the case when  $g_0$  admits an elliptic (broken) geodesic which has no resonances of order  $\leq 4$  and has a nondegenerate BNF.

Let us formulate the main problems that we are going to investigate. Denote by  $\Delta_t$  the "geometric" Laplace-Beltrami operator corresponding to the Riemannian manifold  $(X, g_t)$  with Dirichlet, Neumann or Robin boundary conditions. This is a self-adjoint operator in  $L^2(X)$  with discrete spectrum accumulating at  $+\infty$ . The corresponding eigenvalues  $\lambda$  solve the spectral problem

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_t u &= \lambda u & \text{in } X, \\ \mathcal{B}_t u &= 0, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where  $\mathcal{B}_t u = u|_\Gamma$  in the case of Dirichlet boundary conditions,  $\mathcal{B}_t u = \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_t}|_\Gamma$  in the case of Neumann boundary conditions, and  $\mathcal{B}_t u = \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_t}|_\Gamma - f u|_\Gamma$  in the case of Robin boundary conditions, where  $\nu_t(x)$ ,  $x \in \Gamma_t$ , is the outward unit normal to  $\Gamma$  with respect to the metric  $g_t$  and  $f$  is a smooth real valued function on  $\Gamma$ .

The method we use is based on the construction of  $C^1$  smooth with respect to  $t$  quasi-modes. This method has been applied in [56] in order to investigate the spectral rigidity of the problem (1.1) with Robin boundary conditions in the case when the metric  $g$  is fixed and  $t \rightarrow f_t$  is a continuous deformation of the function appearing in the Robin boundary condition. Let us formulate the isospectral condition.

Consider a union  $\mathcal{I}$  of infinitely many disjoint intervals  $[a_k, b_k]$  going to infinity, of length  $o(\sqrt{a_k})$ , and which are polynomially separated.

More precisely, fix two positive constants  $d \geq 0$  and  $c > 0$ , and suppose that

(H<sub>1</sub>)  $\mathcal{I} \subset (0, \infty)$  is a union of infinitely many disjoint intervals  $[a_k, b_k]$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that

- $\lim a_k = \lim b_k = +\infty$ ;
- $\lim \frac{b_k - a_k}{\sqrt{a_k}} = 0$ ;
- $a_{k+1} - b_k \geq c b_k^{-d}$  for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Given a set  $\mathcal{I}$  satisfying  $(H_1)$ , we impose the following “*weak isospectral assumption*”

$(H_2)$  *There is a  $a \geq 1$  such that  $\text{Spec}(\Delta_t) \cap [a, +\infty) \subset \mathcal{I} \quad \forall t \in [0, 1]$ .*

Note that the length of the intervals  $[a_k, b_k]$  can increase and even go to infinity as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  but not faster than  $o(\sqrt{a_k})$ . Physically this means that we allow noise in the system. Using the asymptotic behavior of the eigenvalues  $\lambda_j$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$  one can show that conditions  $(H_1)$ – $(H_2)$  are “natural” for any  $d > n/2$  and  $c > 0$ . By “natural” we mean that for any  $d > n/2$  and  $c > 0$  the usual isospectral condition

$$\text{Spec}(\Delta_t) = \text{Spec}(\Delta_0) \quad \forall t \in [0, 1]$$

implies that there exists  $a \geq 1$  and a family of infinitely many disjoint intervals  $[a_k, b_k]$  such that  $(H_1)$ – $(H_2)$  are satisfied – see [56], Lemma 2.2, for details. The exponent  $d$  depends on the level spacing of the spectrum of  $\Delta_0$ .

The elastic reflection of geodesics of  $(X, g_t)$  at  $\Gamma$  determines continuous curves on  $X$  called *billiard trajectories* as well as a discontinuous dynamical system on the corresponding cosphere bundle  $S_t^*X$  – the “*billiard flow*” consisting of broken bicharacteristics of the Hamiltonian  $h_t$  associated to  $g_t$  via the Legendre transform. The latter induces a discrete dynamical system  $B_t$  defined on an open subset  $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_t^*\Gamma$  (depending on  $t$ ) of the open coball bundle  $\mathbf{B}_t^*\Gamma$  of  $\Gamma$  called billiard ball map (see Section 2.1 for a definition). The map  $B_t : \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_t^*\Gamma \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_t^*\Gamma$  is exact symplectic. Fix an integer  $m \geq 1$  and consider the exact symplectic map

$$P_t = B_t^m : U_t \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_t^*\Gamma$$

where  $U_t$  is an open subset of  $\mathbf{B}_t^*\Gamma_t$  such that  $B_t^j(U_t) \subset \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_t^*\Gamma$  for any  $0 \leq j < m$ . Given an interval  $J \subset [0, 1]$  we say that  $P_t = B_t^m$ ,  $t \in J$ , is a  $C^1$  family of exact symplectic maps if for every  $t_0 \in J$  and  $\rho^0 \in U_{t_0}$  there exist neighborhoods  $J_0 \subset J$  of  $t_0$  and  $V \subset U_{t_0}$  of  $\rho^0$  such that  $V \subset U_t$  for every  $t \in J_0$  and the map  $J_0 \ni t \mapsto P_t|_V \in C^\infty(V, T^*\Gamma)$  is  $C^1$ .

We are interested in Kronecker invariant tori of  $P_t$  of Diophantine frequencies, which are defined as follows.

We denote by  $\mathbb{T}^d$  the torus  $\mathbb{T}^d := \mathbb{R}^d / 2\pi\mathbb{Z}^d$  of dimension  $d \geq 1$  and by  $\text{pr} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^d$  the canonical projection and we consider  $\mathbb{T}^d$  as a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module. A distance from a given  $\alpha \in \mathbb{T} := \mathbb{T}^1$  to 0 can be defined by

$$|\alpha|_{\mathbb{T}} := \inf\{|a| : a \in \text{pr}^{-1}(\alpha)\}.$$

Fix  $\kappa \in (0, 1)$  and  $\tau > n - 1$  and denote by  $D(\kappa, \tau)$  the set all  $\omega \in \mathbb{T}^{n-1} = \mathbb{R}^{n-1} / 2\pi\mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$  satisfying the  $(\kappa, \tau)$ -Diophantine condition

$$|\langle k, \omega \rangle|_{\mathbb{T}} = |k_1\omega_1 + \dots + k_{n-1}\omega_{n-1}|_{\mathbb{T}} \geq \frac{\kappa}{\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} |k_j|\right)^\tau} \quad \forall k = (k_1, \dots, k_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1} \setminus \{0\}. \quad (1.2)$$

The condition (1.2) is equivalent to the following one. There exists  $\tilde{\omega}' \in \text{pr}^{-1}(\omega)$  such that

$$|\langle \tilde{\omega}', k \rangle + 2\pi k_n| \geq \frac{\kappa}{\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} |k_j|\right)^\tau} \quad \forall (k, k_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{Z}, \quad k \neq 0.$$

Obviously, if this condition is satisfied for one  $\tilde{\omega}' \in \text{pr}^{-1}(\omega)$  then it holds for each  $\tilde{\omega}' \in \text{pr}^{-1}(\omega)$ . We denote by  $\tilde{D}(\kappa, \tau)$  the set all  $\tilde{\omega} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  satisfying the following  $(\kappa, \tau)$ -Diophantine condition:

$$|\langle \tilde{\omega}, k \rangle| \geq \frac{\kappa}{\left(\sum_{j=1}^n |k_j|\right)^\tau} \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}^n, \quad k \neq 0. \quad (1.3)$$

Thus the relation  $\omega \in D(\kappa, \tau)$  implies that  $\tilde{\omega} := (\tilde{\omega}', 2\pi) \in \tilde{D}(\kappa, \tau)$  for at least one (and then for all)  $\tilde{\omega}' \in \text{pr}^{-1}(\omega)$ .

**Definition 1.1** *A Kronecker torus of  $P_t$  of a frequency  $\omega$  is an embedded submanifold  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$  of  $\mathbf{B}_t^*\Gamma$  diffeomorphic to  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1}$  such that*

- (i)  $B_t^j(\Lambda_t(\omega))$  is a subset of  $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_t^*\Gamma$  for each  $0 \leq j \leq m-1$ ;
- (ii)  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$  is invariant with respect to  $P_t = B_t^m$ ;
- (iii) The restriction of  $P_t$  to  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$  is  $C^\infty$  conjugated to the translation  $R_\omega : \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^{n-1}$  given by  $R_\omega(\varphi) = \varphi + \omega$ .

This means that there is a smooth embedding  $f_{t,\omega} : \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_t^*\Gamma$  such that  $\Lambda_t(\omega) = f_{t,\omega}(\mathbb{T}^{n-1})$  and the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{T}^{n-1} & \xrightarrow{R_\omega} & \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \\ \downarrow f_{t,\omega} & & \downarrow f_{t,\omega} \\ \Lambda_t(\omega) & \xrightarrow{P_t} & \Lambda_t(\omega) \end{array} \quad (1.4)$$

is commutative.

**Definition 1.2** *By a  $C^1$ -smooth family of Kronecker tori  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$  of  $P_t$ ,  $t \in [0, \delta]$ , with a frequency  $\omega$  we mean a  $C^1$  family of smooth embeddings  $[0, \delta] \ni t \mapsto f_{t,\omega} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^{n-1}, T^*\Gamma)$  satisfying (i)-(iii) of Definition 1.1.*

For each Diophantine frequency  $\omega \in D(\kappa, \tau)$  the embedding  $f_{t,\omega} : \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_t^*\Gamma$  is a *Lagrange embedding* (see [20], Sect. I.3.2). We simply say that each Kronecker torus  $\Lambda_t(\omega) \subset \mathbf{B}_t^*\Gamma$  is Lagrangian for such frequencies. Note that the map  $P_t : \Lambda_t(\omega) \rightarrow \Lambda_t(\omega)$  is uniquely ergodic for  $\omega \in D(\kappa, \tau)$ , i.e. there is a unique probability measure  $\mu_t$  on  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$  which is  $P_t$  invariant. Evidently, its pull-back  $f_{t,\omega}^*(d\mu_t)$  by the diffeomorphism  $f_{t,\omega}$  coincides with the Lebesgue-Haar measure  $d\theta$  of  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1}$ . The automorphism  $x \mapsto \frac{x}{2\pi}$  of  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  induces an isomorphism of groups  $j : \mathbb{R}^{n-1}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n-1}/\mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$  assigning to any frequency vector  $\omega$  the corresponding rotation vector which will be denoted by  $\omega/2\pi$ . Hereafter we will deal mainly with frequency vectors which is motivated by the extensive use of the Fourier analysis.

To any Kronecker torus  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$  with a Diophantine frequency  $\omega \in D(\kappa, \tau)$  one can associate three dynamical invariants as follows.

The first one is the *average action* on the torus, which corresponds to the Mather's  $\beta$ -function in the case of twist maps. Given  $\varrho \in \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_t^*\Gamma$  we denote by

$$A_t(\varrho) := \int_{\tilde{\gamma}_t(\varrho)} \xi dx$$

the action on the broken bicharacteristic  $\tilde{\gamma}_t(\varrho)$  “issuing from”  $\varrho_0 := \varrho$  and “having endpoint” at  $\varrho_m := P_t(\varrho)$ , where  $\xi dx$  is the fundamental one-form on  $T^*X$ . Denote by  $X_{h_t}$  the Hamiltonian vector field where  $h_t$  is the Legendre transform of the metric tensor  $g_t$ . The broken bicharacteristic  $\tilde{\gamma}_t(\varrho)$  is a disjoint union of integral curves  $\gamma_t(\varrho_j)$  of the Hamiltonian vector field  $X_{h_t}$  “issuing” from  $\varrho_j := B_t^j(\varrho)$  and “ending” at  $\varrho_{j+1} = B_t^{j+1}(\varrho)$  and lying on the coshere bundle

$\Sigma_t := S_t^* X = \{h_t = 1\}$  (for a more precise definition see Section 2.1). The vertices of  $\tilde{\gamma}_t(\varrho)$  can be identified with  $\varrho_j$ ,  $0 \leq j \leq m$ , and we have

$$A_t(\varrho) = \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \int_{\gamma_t(\varrho_j)} \xi dx.$$

Notice that  $2A_t(\varrho)$  is just the length of the broken geodesic in  $(X, g_t)$  obtained by projecting the broken bicharacteristic  $\tilde{\gamma}_t(\varrho)$  to  $X$ . In particular,  $A_t(\varrho) > 0$ . By Birkhoff's ergodic theorem

$$\beta_t(\omega) := -2 \lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{k=-N}^{N-1} A_t(P_t^k \varrho) = -2 \int_{\Lambda_t(\omega)} A_t d\mu_t < 0 \quad (1.5)$$

does not depend on the choice of  $\varrho \in \Lambda_t(\omega)$ . The function  $\beta_t$  can be extended as a convex function in the case when  $n = 2$  and  $P_t$  is a monotone twist map. It can be related to the Mather's  $\beta$ -function  $\beta_t^M$  [62] (cf. also [61]) by the isomorphism  $j : \mathbb{R}^{n-1}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n-1}/\mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$ , i.e.  $\beta_t = \beta_t^M \circ j$ .

Another invariant of a Kronecker torus  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$  with a Diophantine frequency is the *Liouville class* on it which is defined as the cohomology class  $[f_{t,\omega}^*(\xi dx)] \in H^1(\mathbb{T}^{n-1}, \mathbb{R})$ , where  $\xi dx$  stands for the fundamental one-form of  $T^*\Gamma$  (recall that  $f_{t,\omega} : \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_t^*\Gamma$  is a Lagrange embedding). Let  $e_1, \dots, e_{n-1}$  be the canonical basis of  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  and  $s \rightarrow c_j(s) = \text{pr}(se_j)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, n-1$ , be the corresponding loops on  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1}$ . Then  $\gamma_{t,\omega}^j := f_{t,\omega} \circ c_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, n-1$ , provide a basis of loops of  $H_1(\Lambda_t(\omega), \mathbb{Z})$ . In the dual basis of  $H^1(\mathbb{T}^{n-1}, \mathbb{R})$  we write  $[f_{t,\omega}^*(\xi dx)]$  as

$$I_t(\omega) = \left( \int_{\gamma_{t,\omega}^1} \xi dx, \dots, \int_{\gamma_{t,\omega}^{n-1}} \xi dx \right). \quad (1.6)$$

The *Birkhoff Normal Form* (BNF) of  $P_t$  is another invariant related to a Kronecker torus. To each Kronecker torus  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$  with a Diophantine frequency  $\omega$  one can associate a BNF of  $P_t$  as follows. There exist an exact symplectic map  $\chi_t$  from a neighborhood of  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \{I_t(\omega)\}$  in  $T^*\mathbb{T}^{n-1}$  to a neighborhood of  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$  in  $T^*\Gamma$  a smooth function  $L_t$  and a map  $R_t$  such that  $\Lambda_t(\omega) = \chi_t(\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \{I_t(\omega)\})$  and

$$(\chi_t^{-1} \circ P_t \circ \chi_t)(\varphi, I) = (\varphi + \nabla L_t(I), I) + R_t(\varphi, I), \quad \partial_I^\alpha R_t(\varphi, I_t(\omega)) = 0 \quad \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{n-1}, \quad (1.7)$$

(see Sect. 6). The BNF of  $P_t$  at the torus  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$  is said to be *nondegenerate* if the Hessian matrix of  $L_t$  at  $I = I_t(\omega)$  is nondegenerate, i.e.

$$\det \partial_I^2 L_t(I_t(\omega)) \neq 0. \quad (1.8)$$

One can choose  $L_t$  such that

$$\beta_t(\omega) + L_t(I_t(\omega)) = \langle \omega, I_t(\omega) \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla L_t(I_t(\omega)) = \omega \quad (1.9)$$

(see Lemma 6.4).

Given an interval  $J \subset [0, 1]$  and a  $C^1$  family of Kronecker tori  $J \ni t \mapsto \Lambda_t(\omega)$ , we say that (1.7) provides a  $C^1$  family of BNFs in  $J$  if  $t \rightarrow \chi_t$ ,  $t \rightarrow L_t$  and  $t \rightarrow R_t$  are  $C^1$  families with values in the corresponding  $C^\infty$  spaces (see Definition 6.2).

Let  $[0, \bar{\delta}] \ni t \rightarrow P_t$  be a  $C^1$  family of exact symplectic maps and  $0 < \bar{\delta} \leq 1$ . We are interested in the following problems.

**Problem I.** *Let  $\Lambda_0(\omega_0)$  be a Kronecker torus of  $P_0$  with a  $(\kappa_1, \tau)$ -Diophantine frequency  $\omega_0 \in D(\kappa_1, \tau)$ , where  $0 < \kappa_1 \leq 1$  and  $\tau > n - 1$ . Suppose that the BNF of  $P_0$  at  $\Lambda_0(\omega_0)$  is nondegenerate. Do there exist  $\Xi \subset \mathbb{T}^{n-1}$  and  $0 < \delta \leq \bar{\delta}$  such that*

1.  $\omega_0 \in \Xi$  and  $\Xi$  is a set of Diophantine frequencies of full Lebesgue measure at  $\omega_0$  which means that  $\text{meas}(\Xi \cap W) = \text{meas}(W) + o(\text{meas}(W))$  as  $\text{meas}(W) \rightarrow 0$  for any open neighborhood  $W$  of  $\omega_0$ ;
2. For each  $\omega \in \Xi$  there exists a  $C^1$  family of Kronecker tori  $[0, \delta] \ni t \mapsto \Lambda_t(\omega)$  of  $P_t$ .

A positive answer of this question is given by Theorem 1, item 2, and Theorem 6.1. The set  $\Xi$  is of the form (see Section 6)

$$\Xi = \bigcup_{0 < \kappa \leq \kappa_1} \Omega_\kappa^0 \quad (1.10)$$

where  $\kappa_0 \leq \kappa_1$ ,  $\omega_0 \in \Omega_\kappa^0$  and the set  $\Omega_\kappa^0$  consists only of points of positive Lebesgue density for any  $\kappa$  fixed. The latter means that for each  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$  and any open neighborhood  $W \subset \mathbb{T}^{n-1}$  of  $\omega$  the set  $\Omega_\kappa^0 \cap W$  has a positive Lebesgue measure. Moreover, Theorem 6.1 gives a  $C^1$  family of simultaneous BNFs associated with the  $C^1$  families of invariant tori

$$[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow \Lambda_t(\omega) \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$$

which means that the family of symplectic maps  $\chi_t$ ,  $t \in [0, \delta]$ , is  $C^1$  and for any fixed  $t$  the map  $\chi_t$  provides a BNF (1.7) of  $P_t$  at  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$  for all  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$  at once. We apply that to the following three situations

1.  $(X, g_0)$  is a nondegenerate Classical Liouville Billiard table as defined in Section 3. Then the billiard ball map  $P_0 = B_0$  is completely integrable and the Kolmogorov non-degeneracy condition is fulfilled. Hence Theorem 1, 1-2, and Theorem 6.1 hold for every invariant torus of Diophantine frequency in this case.
2.  $(X, g_0)$  has an elliptic closed broken geodesic with  $m \geq 2$  vertices of no resonances of order  $\leq 4$  and with a nondegenerate BNF (see Section 4). The corresponding return map  $P_0 = B_0^m$  has a large family of Kronecker tori with Diophantine frequencies, the BNF of each of them is nondegenerate and one can apply Theorem 1, 1-2, and Theorem 6.1.
3.  $(X, g_0)$  is a locally strictly geodesically convex billiard table of dimension two (see Section 5). Then there exists a large family of Kronecker tori with Diophantine frequencies of the billiard ball map  $P_0 = B_0$ . These invariant circles accumulate at the boundary  $S_0^* \Gamma$  of the coball bundle  $\mathbf{B}_0^* \Gamma$  and give rise of the so called Lazutkin caustics in the interior of  $X$ . Close to  $S_0^* \Gamma$  the map  $P_0 = B_0$  is twisted. This implies that the BNF of  $P_0$  is nondegenerate at each Kronecker torus sufficiently close to  $S_0^* \Gamma$  and we can apply Theorem 1, 1-2, as well as Theorem 6.1.

From now on we denote by  $\Xi$  a set of Diophantine frequencies of the form (1.10) such that the items 1. and 2. in Problem I are satisfied in  $\Xi$ .

Problem II. *Let  $(X, g_t)$ ,  $t \in [0, 1]$ , be a  $C^1$  family of billiard tables satisfying the weak isospectral condition  $(H_1)$ – $(H_2)$ . Consider a  $C^1$  family of Kronecker tori  $[0, \delta] \ni t \mapsto \Lambda_t(\omega)$  of  $P_t$  for each  $\omega \in \Xi$ . Are the functions  $t \rightarrow \beta_t(\omega)$ ,  $t \rightarrow I_t(\omega)$  and  $t \rightarrow L_t(I_t(\omega))$  independent of  $t \in [0, \delta]$  for each  $\omega \in \Xi$ ?*

Affirmative answer of this question is given in Theorem 1 and Theorem 2. This result can be applied in the cases 1. – 3. listed above. The proof is based on the construction of  $C^1$  families of quasi-modes of the spectral problem (1.1) in Theorem 8.2. We present below the main idea of the proof.

Problem III. *Does the weak isospectral condition  $(H_1)$ – $(H_2)$  imply the existence of a  $C^1$  family of Kronecker tori  $[0, 1] \ni t \mapsto \Lambda_t(\omega)$  of  $P_t$  all along the perturbation for each  $\omega \in \Xi$ ?*

This problem is closely related with a mysterious phenomena in the Hamiltonian dynamics of close to integrable systems - the destruction of Kronecker tori with Diophantine frequencies along a perturbation. The  $C^1$  family of Kronecker tori  $t \mapsto \Lambda_t(\omega)$  exists in a certain interval  $[0, \delta_0)$  but it may cease to exist at  $t = \delta_0$ . Does the “weak isospectral condition” prevent the tori from destroying? We give a positive answer of Problem III in the following two cases - in the case 2. mentioned above if the elliptic periodic broken geodesic has no resonances of order  $\leq 12$  (see Theorem 4.4 and Proposition 4.5) and for the Lazutkin caustics in the case of a  $C^1$  deformation of a strictly convex billiard table in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  (see Theorem 4). The proof of these two results is rather involved. It requires a K.A.M. theorem and BNF theorem where the constant  $\epsilon$  appearing in the smallness condition essentially depends only on the dimension  $n$  and the exponent  $\tau > n - 1$  but not on the particular completely integrable Hamiltonian (see Theorem 9.7 and Theorem 9.10). We need as well suitable uniform with respect to  $t$  estimates of the Hölder  $C^\ell$  norms of the functions  $L_t$  in the BNF (1.7). These estimates are obtained in Theorem 9.10.

Given a strictly convex billiard tables in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , a natural question to ask is if Problem III has a positive answer for all the Kronecker tori of  $B_t$  with Diophantine frequencies. Let  $(X_t, g)$ ,  $t \in [0, \delta_0]$  be a  $C^1$ -family of strictly convex billiard tables in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  where  $g$  is the Euclidean metric. Then  $P_t = B_t$  is a twist map for  $0 \leq t \leq \delta_0$ . Identifying  $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  with  $[0, 1]$  let us consider Mather’s  $\beta$  function  $\beta_t^M : [0, \frac{1}{2}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of  $B_t$  for  $t \in [0, \delta_0]$ . Suppose that  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$ ,  $t \in [0, \delta_0]$  is  $C^1$  family of Kronecker tori with frequencies in  $\Omega_\kappa^0$  and that  $\beta_t(\omega) = \beta_0(\omega)$  for each  $t \in [0, \delta_0]$  and  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$ . For any  $t \in [0, \delta_0]$  the function  $\beta_t^M \circ j : [0, \pi] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , where  $j(\omega) = \frac{\omega}{2\pi}$  for  $\omega \in [0, \pi]$ , is an extension of the function  $\beta_t : \Omega_\kappa^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  given by (1.5) and we set  $\beta_t := \beta_t^M \circ j$ . By (1.9) we have

$$\beta_t(\omega) = \beta_0(\omega) = \langle \omega, I_0(\omega) - L_0(I_0(\omega)) \rangle \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0,$$

hence,  $\beta_t|_{\Omega_\kappa^0}$ ,  $t \in [0, \delta_0]$  is the restriction on  $\Omega_\kappa^0$  of a smooth in  $[0, \pi]$  function which is independent of  $t$ . On the other hand,  $\beta_t$  simply converges to  $\beta_{\delta_0}$  as  $t \rightarrow \delta_0$  and we obtain that  $\beta_{\delta_0}|_{\Omega_\kappa^0}$  is the restriction on  $\Omega_\kappa^0$  of a smooth in  $[0, \pi]$  function, which means that the function  $\beta_{\delta_0} : \Omega_\kappa^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is  $C^\infty$  smooth in a Whitney sense. Recall that each point of  $\Omega_\kappa^0 \subset [0, \pi]$  is a point of positive Lebesgue density. It is plausible to conjecture that

(C) If  $\beta_{\delta_0}|_{\Omega_\kappa^0}$  is  $C^\infty$  smooth in a Whitney sense then for each  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$  there exists a Kronecker torus  $\Lambda_{\delta_0}(\omega)$  with a frequency vector  $\omega$ .

If (C) was true then one could obtain an affirmative answer of Problem III using Theorem 1 in a neighborhood of  $t = \delta_0$ . The same argument would hold for classical Liouville billiard tables in dimension two and in particular for the billiard in the ellipse. As a consequence one could obtain spectral rigidity of classical Liouville billiard tables in dimension two.

Problem IV. *Spectral rigidity.*

We show in Proposition 2.1 that the variation  $\dot{\beta}_t(\omega)$ ,  $\omega \in \Xi$ , can be written by means of a suitable Radon transform at the family of Kronecker tori  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$ ,  $\omega \in \Xi$ , applied to the “vertical component” of the variation of the boundary  $\Gamma_t$ . In particular, the equality  $\beta_t(\omega) = \beta_0(\omega)$ ,  $t \in [0, \delta]$ ,  $\omega \in \Xi$ , obtained in Theorem 2 implies that the image of this Radon transform is zero for any weakly isospectral family (see Theorem 3). Hence, to prove infinitesimal rigidity one has to obtain injectivity of that Radon transform. In this way we obtain infinitesimal spectral rigidity under the weak isospectral conditions for classical Liouville Billiard Tables of dimension 2 and 3 in Theorem 3.3 and Theorem 3.4. We obtain in particular that the billiard tables inside the ellipse in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  and inside the ellipsoid in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  are infinitesimally spectrally rigid under the weak-isospectral conditions  $(H_1) - (H_2)$ . Infinitesimal spectral rigidity of the billiard table inside the ellipse has been obtained by Hezari and Zelditch [21] under the usual isospectral condition using the wave-trace method. Unfortunately infinitesimal spectral rigidity does not always apply spectral rigidity as in the case of negatively curved manifolds because of the phenomena of destruction of Kronecker tori with Diophantine frequencies.

As an application of Theorem 3 we prove in Theorem 4.3 spectral rigidity of analytic  $\mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2$  symmetric billiard tables  $(X_t, g)$  of dimension two if one of the corresponding bouncing ball trajectories is elliptic, it has no resonances of order  $\leq 4$  and the Poincaré map is nondegenerate.

Before giving the structure of the paper we would like to compare different features of the spectral rigidity problem in the cases of negatively curved closed manifolds and of close to integrable Hamiltonian systems.

| <u>negative curvature</u>                                  | <u>close to integrable</u>                                                    |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Anosov system                                              | K.A.M. system                                                                 |
| $C^1$ families of hyperbolic closed geodesics              | $C^1$ families of Kronecker tori                                              |
| Labeled length spectrum                                    | Average action on the Kronecker tori,<br>Mather's $\beta$ function            |
| Wave trace formula                                         | $C^1$ families of quasi-modes                                                 |
| Geodesic ray transform                                     | Radon transform on Kronecker tori                                             |
| Structural stability of Anosov dynamics                    | Phenomena of destruction of invariant tori<br>with Diophantine frequencies    |
| Infinitesimal rigidity easily<br>implies spectral rigidity | Passing from infinitesimal rigidity to<br>spectral rigidity is a hard problem |

We are going to describe now the structure of the paper.

In Section 2 we recall first the definition of the billiard ball map and then we formulate some

of the main results. We give as well a proof of Theorem 3 which reduces the spectral rigidity problem to the injectivity of a suitable Radon transform.

Section 3 is devoted to Liouville billiard tables of dimension  $n = 2$  or  $n = 3$ . Liouville billiard tables of dimension two were defined in [53, Sec. 2] by using a branched double covering map. We give here an invariant definition of Liouville billiard tables in dimension two and we prove the equivalence of the two definitions in Appendix B.1. Then we recall the definition of Liouville billiard tables of classical type in dimension two. Infinitesimal spectral rigidity of such billiard tables under the “weak isospectral condition” is obtained in Theorem 3.3. Infinitesimal spectral rigidity of nondegenerate Liouville billiard tables of classical type in dimension three is obtained in Theorem 3.4. Here we essentially use the injectivity of the corresponding Radon transform which has been proven in [55]. In particular we obtain infinitesimal spectral rigidity of the ellipse in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  and the ellipsoid in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  under the “weak isospectral conditions”.

In Section 4 we consider  $C^1$  isospectral deformations  $[0, 1] \ni t \rightarrow (X, g_t)$  of a given billiard table  $(X, g_0)$  admitting an elliptic closed broken geodesic  $\gamma$  with  $m \geq 2$  vertices and we denote by  $P_0 := B_0^m$  the corresponding Poincaré map. We suppose that  $\gamma$  admits no resonances of order  $\leq 4$  and that the BNF of  $P_0$  is nondegenerate. By the implicit function theorem there exists  $\bar{\delta} > 0$  and a  $C^1$  family of elliptic closed broken geodesics  $\gamma_t$ ,  $t \in [0, \bar{\delta})$ , with  $m \geq 2$  vertices in  $(X, g_t)$  having no resonances of order  $\leq 4$  and such that the BNF of the corresponding Poincaré maps  $P_t$  are nondegenerate. Theorem 4.3 gives spectral rigidity for a class of analytic  $\mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2$  symmetric billiard tables of dimension two. Then we address the following questions. Suppose that the  $C^1$  family of billiard tables  $(X, g_t)$ ,  $0 \leq t \leq 1$ , is weakly isospectral. Assume that  $(X, g_0)$  admits a periodic elliptic broken geodesic  $\gamma_0$  and that the corresponding local Poincaré map is twisted. Does there exist a  $C^1$  family of periodic elliptic broken geodesics  $[0, 1] \ni t \rightarrow \gamma_t$  in  $(X, g_t)$  along the whole perturbation? Do the corresponding local Poincaré map remain twisted? Do the invariant tori  $\Lambda_0(\omega)$  associated to  $\gamma_0$  give rise to  $C^1$  families of invariant tori  $[0, 1] \ni t \rightarrow \Lambda_t(\omega)$  along the whole perturbation? We give an answer of these questions in Theorem 4.4 and Proposition 4.5.

Section 5 is devoted to isospectral deformations of locally strictly geodesically convex billiard tables of dimension two. Firstly we obtain in Proposition 5.1 a  $C^1$  family of BNFs for the billiard ball maps  $B_t$  in a neighborhood of  $S_t^* \Gamma$  in terms of the interpolating Hamiltonian  $\zeta_t$  introduced by Marvizi and Melrose [39]. Then Theorem 5.2 gives an affirmative answer of Problems I-III in the case of  $C^1$  families  $(X, g_t)$ ,  $t \in [0, \delta]$ , of locally strictly geodesically convex billiard tables of dimension two satisfying the weak isospectral condition  $(H_1) - (H_2)$ . Moreover, if  $(X_t, g)$ ,  $t \in [0, 1]$ , is a  $C^1$  family of billiard tables in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  equipped with the Euclidean metric and satisfying the weak isospectral condition and if  $X_0$  is strictly convex then we prove in that  $X_t$  remains strictly convex for each  $t \in [0, 1]$  and we get an affirmative answer of Problem III for  $t \in [0, 1]$  (see Theorem 4).

In Section 6 we obtain by Theorem 6.1 a  $C^1$  family of BNFs of  $P_t$  associated with  $C^1$  families of Kronecker tori  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$ , where  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$ ,  $t \in J$ , and  $J \subset [0, \delta_0]$  is an interval. The theorem is based on the BNF obtained in Theorem 9.10.

In Section 7 we reduce the problem (1.1) microlocally at the boundary. The idea is explained in the beginning of Section 7. Let  $f_t = f_t(\cdot, \lambda)$  be a  $\frac{1}{2}$ -density on  $\Gamma$  depending on a large parameter  $\lambda$  and with a frequency support contained in a small neighborhood of the union of the invariant tori  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$ . We consider the corresponding outgoing solution  $u_t$  of the reduced wave equation (the Helmholtz equation) in  $X_t$  with initial data  $f_t$  and we “reflect it at the boundary”  $m - 1$  times if  $m \geq 2$ . To this end we use the outgoing parametrix of the reduced wave equation which

is a Fourier Integral Operator with a large parameter  $\lambda$  ( $\lambda$ -FIO). Taking the pull-back to  $\Gamma$  of the last branch of the solution  $u_t(\cdot, \lambda)$  we get a  $\frac{1}{2}$ -density  $M_t^0(\lambda)f_t$ , where  $M_t^0(\lambda)$  is a  $\lambda$ -FIO of order zero at  $\Gamma$  the canonical relation of which is just the graph of  $P_t$ . We call  $M_t^0(\lambda)$  a monodromy operator. In this way obtain

$$(-\Delta_t + \lambda^2)u_t = O_N(|\lambda|^{-N})f_t, \quad \mathcal{B}_t u_t = O_N(|\lambda|^{-N})f_t$$

if and only if

$$M_t^0(\lambda)f_t = f_t + O_N(|\lambda|^{-N})f.$$

We are looking for couples  $(\lambda, f_t)$  solving the last equation. To this end using the BNF of  $P_t$  we obtain a suitable microlocal (quantum) Birkhoff normal form of  $M_t^0(\lambda)$  for  $t \in J$  (see Proposition 7.11 and Proposition 7.12 in Sect. 7.3). This enables us to "separate the variables" microlocally near the whole family of invariant tori  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$ , and to obtain a microlocal spectral decomposition of  $M_t^0(\lambda)$  in Proposition 7.15. Then the problem of finding  $\lambda$  is reduced to an algebraic equation  $\mu_t(\lambda) = 1 + O_N(|\lambda|^{-N})$  where  $\mu_t(\lambda)$  are suitable eigenvalues of  $M_t^0(\lambda)$  with eigenfunctions  $f_t$ . In this way we obtain that  $\lambda$  should satisfy (7.123) and (7.124) and we solve that system of equations recursively. This is done in Section 8, where we obtain  $C^1$  families of quasi-modes. Using these quasi-modes we prove item 3 of Theorem 1 which claims that the function  $t \rightarrow \beta_t(\omega)$  is independent of  $t$  for Diophantine frequencies  $\omega$  provided that the weak isospectral condition  $(H_1)-(H_1)$  is fulfilled. We are going to give the idea of the proof.

#### Sketch of the Proof.

We fix  $t \in [0, \delta)$ ,  $\kappa > 0$  and  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$  and we impose the following

*Strong Quantization Condition on the torus  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$ .* There exists an infinite sequence  $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\omega)$  of  $(q, \lambda) \in \mathbb{Z}^n \times [1, \infty)$  such that  $q = (k, k_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{Z}$  and  $\lambda = \mu_q^0 \geq 1$  satisfy

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} c_0^{-1}|q| \leq \mu_q^0 \leq c_0|q| \\ \lim_{|q| \rightarrow \infty} \left| \mu_q^0 \left( I_t(\omega), L_t(I_t(\omega)) \right) - \left( k + \frac{\vartheta_0}{4}, 2\pi \left( k_n + \frac{\vartheta}{4} \right) \right) \right| = 0. \end{array} \right. \quad (1.11)$$

Here  $c_0 > 1$  is a constant,  $(\vartheta, \vartheta_0) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ ,  $\vartheta$  is related with the Maslov class of  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$  and  $\vartheta_0$  is a Maslov index. It turns out that condition (1.11) is satisfied for each  $\omega$  in a subset  $\Xi_\kappa^t \subset \Omega_\kappa^0$  of full Lebesgue measure in  $\Omega_\kappa^0$  (see Lemma 8.1).

Now we fix  $\omega \in \Xi_\kappa^t$  and denote by  $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$  the image of the projection of  $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\omega) \subset \mathbb{Z}^n \times [1, \infty)$  on the first factor. The set  $\mathcal{M}$  will be the index set of the  $C^1$  family of quasi-modes that we are going to construct. To obtain a quantization condition for the tori  $\Lambda_s(\omega)$  for  $s$  close to  $t$  we introduce for any  $q \in \mathcal{M}$  the interval

$$J_q := [t, t + 2|q|^{-1}].$$

Since the maps  $s \mapsto L_s$  and  $s \mapsto I_s$  are  $C^1$  in a neighborhood of  $t$  with values in the corresponding  $C^\infty$  spaces (see Theorem 6.1 and Definition 6.2), the following quantization condition of the tori  $\Lambda_s(\omega)$  is satisfied

*Quantization Condition.* There exists a constant  $C = C(\omega) > 0$  independent of  $q \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $s \in J_q$  such that

$$\left| \mu_q^0(I_s(\omega), L_s(I_s(\omega))) - \left( k + \frac{\vartheta_0}{4}, 2\pi \left( k_n + \frac{\vartheta}{4} \right) \right) \right| \leq C \quad \forall q \in \mathcal{M}, s \in J_q. \quad (1.12)$$

Using this condition we construct  $C^1$  families quasi-modes  $(\mu_q(s)^2, u_{s,q})$ ,  $q \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $s \in J_q$ , of order  $M$  for the problem (1.1) such that (see Theorem 8.2)

- (1)  $u_{s,q} \in D(\Delta_s)$ ,  $\|u_{s,q}\|_{L^2(X)} = 1$ , and there exists a constant  $C_M > 0$  such that

$$\begin{cases} \|\Delta u_{s,q} - \mu_q^2(s) u_{s,q}\| \leq C_M \mu_q^{-M}(s) & \text{in } L^2(X), \\ \mathcal{B} u_{s,q}|_{\Gamma} = 0 \end{cases}$$

for every  $q \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $s \in J_q$ ;

- (2) We have

$$\mu_q(s) = \mu_q^0 + c_{q,0}(s) + c_{q,1}(s) \frac{1}{\mu_q^0} + \cdots + c_{q,M}(s) \frac{1}{(\mu_q^0)^M}$$

where the functions  $s \mapsto c_{q,j}(s)$  are real valued and  $C^1$  on the interval  $J_q$  and there exists a constant  $C'_M > 0$  such that  $|c_{q,j}(s)| \leq C'_M$  for every  $q \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $0 \leq j \leq M$ , and any  $s \in J_q$ ;

- (3) There exists  $C > 0$  such that

$$\left| \mu_q(s) L_s \left( \frac{k + \vartheta_0/4}{\mu_q(s)} \right) - 2\pi \left( k_n + \frac{\vartheta}{4} \right) \right| \leq \frac{C}{\mu_q(s)}$$

for every  $q \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $s \in J_q$ ;

- (4) We have

$$\frac{k + \vartheta_0/4}{\mu_q(t)} = I_t(\omega) + o\left(\frac{1}{|q|}\right) \quad \text{as } |q| \rightarrow \infty.$$

We point out that the strong quantization condition (1.11) is needed only in the proof of item (4). Items (1)-(3) follow from the weaker quantization condition (1.12). The estimate in (3) is related to the nullity of the subprincipal symbol of the Laplace-Beltrami operator. Note also that the quasi-eigenvalues  $\mu_q(s)^2$  are defined only in the intervals  $J_q$  which shrink to  $t$  as  $q \rightarrow \infty$ .

Consider now the self-adjoint operator  $\Delta_s$  with Dirichlet, Neumann or Robin boundary conditions and the corresponding spectral problem (1.1). The relation between the spectrum of  $\Delta_s$  and the quasi-eigenvalues  $\mu_q(s)^2$  is given by

$$\text{dist}(\text{Spec}(\Delta_s), \mu_q(s)^2) \leq C_M \mu_q^{-M}(s)$$

where  $C_M$  is the constant in (1) and  $M$  is the order of the quasi-mode. We fix  $M > 2d + 2$  where  $d \geq 0$  is the exponent in  $(H_1)$ . It follows then from  $(H_2)$  that the quasi-eigenvalues  $\mu_q(s)^2$ ,  $|q| \geq q_0 \gg 1$ ,  $s \in J_q$ , belong to the union of intervals

$$A_k := \left[ a_k - \frac{c}{2} a_k^{-d-1}, b_k + \frac{c}{2} a_k^{-d-1} \right] \quad k \geq k_0 \gg 1$$

where  $c$  is the positive constant in the third hypothesis of  $(H_1)$ . These intervals do not intersect each other for  $k \geq k_0 \gg 1$  in view of the third hypothesis of  $(H_1)$ . The function  $J_q \ni s \mapsto \mu_q(s)^2$  being continuous in  $J_q$  can not jump from one interval to another, hence, it is trapped in a certain interval  $A_k$ . Then using the first and second hypothesis of  $(H_1)$  we obtain

$$|\mu_q(s) - \mu_q(t)| \leq \frac{1}{\mu_q(t)} |\mu_q(s)^2 - \mu_q(t)^2| \leq 2a_k^{-\frac{1}{2}}(b_k - a_k) = o(a_k^{\frac{1}{2}}) = o(\mu_q(t)) = o\left(\frac{1}{|q|}\right)$$

for  $|q| \geq q_0$  where  $q_0 \gg 1$  does not depend on the choice of  $s \in J_q$ . This implies

$$\mu_q(s) = \mu_q(t) \left(1 + o\left(\frac{1}{|q|}\right)\right) \quad \text{as } q \rightarrow \infty$$

uniformly with respect to  $s \in J_q$ . A detailed proof of this statement is given in Lemma 8.3. Now using (4) we get

$$\zeta_q(s) := \frac{k + \vartheta_0/4}{\mu_q(s)} = \frac{k + \vartheta_0/4}{\mu_q(t)(1 + o(1/|q|))} = \frac{k + \vartheta_0/4}{\mu_q(t)} + o\left(\frac{1}{|q|}\right) = I_t(\omega) + o\left(\frac{1}{|q|}\right), \quad q \rightarrow \infty$$

uniformly with respect to  $s \in J_q$ . In the same way we get from (3)

$$L_s(\zeta_q(s)) = 2\pi \frac{k_n - \vartheta/4}{\mu_q(s)} + O(|q|^{-2}) = 2\pi \frac{k_n - \vartheta/4}{\mu_q(t)} + o\left(\frac{1}{|q|}\right) = L_t(\zeta_q(t)) + o\left(\frac{1}{|q|}\right), \quad q \rightarrow \infty$$

uniformly with respect to  $s \in J_q$ . Setting  $\eta := 1/|q|$  we obtain from the above equalities that

$$\begin{aligned} L_{t+\eta}(I_t(\omega)) &= L_{t+\eta}(\zeta_q(t+\eta) + o(\eta)) = L_{t+\eta}(\zeta_q(t+\eta)) + o(\eta) \\ &= L_t(\zeta_q(t)) + o(\eta) = L_t(I_t(\omega)) + o(\eta), \quad \eta = 1/|q| \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that the map  $[0, \delta] \rightarrow L_s(\cdot)$  is  $C^1$  with values in the corresponding  $C^\infty$  space. Hence,

$$\dot{L}_t(I_t(\omega)) = \frac{d}{ds} L_s(I_t(\omega)) \Big|_{s=t} = 0 \quad \forall \omega \in \Xi_\kappa^t.$$

On the other hand,  $\Xi_\kappa^t$  is dense in  $\Omega_\kappa^0$  since any point of  $\Omega_\kappa^0$  is of positive Lebesgue density and  $\Omega_\kappa^0 \setminus \Xi_\kappa^t$  has measure zero, and by continuity (the function  $I \rightarrow \dot{L}_t(I)$  is smooth) we get this equality for each  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$ . The point  $t$  has been fixed arbitrary in  $[0, \delta)$ , hence,  $\dot{L}_t(I_t(\omega)) = 0$  for every  $t \in [0, \delta)$  and  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$ . Now differentiating the first equation of (1.9) with respect to  $t$  we obtain

$$\dot{\beta}_t(\omega) = \langle \omega, \dot{I}_t(\omega) \rangle - \dot{L}_t(I_t(\omega)) - \langle \nabla L_t(I_t(\omega)), \dot{I}_t(\omega) \rangle = 0 \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$$

since  $\nabla L_t(I_t(\omega)) = \omega$ . Hence,  $\beta_t(\omega) = \beta_0(\omega)$  for every  $t \in [0, \delta)$  and  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$ . By continuity we get the last equality for every  $t \in [0, \delta]$  as well.  $\square$

The second part of the manuscript is devoted to the K.A.M. theorem and the BNF around families of invariant tori in both the continuous and discrete cases. The main novelty in it can be briefly summarized as follows

- the constant  $\epsilon$  in the smallness condition essentially depends only on the dimension of the configuration space and on the exponent in the Diophantine condition;

- $C^k$  smooth families of invariant tori  $t \rightarrow \Lambda_t(\omega)$  with Diophantine frequencies are obtained;
- $C^k$  smooth with respect to the parameter  $t$  BNF is obtained around the union of  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$ ;
- estimates in suitable Hölder norms with universal constants are obtained.

We need all these properties in the first part of the manuscript. The K.A.M. theorems here are based on Theorem 10.1 which is a K.A.M. theorem for  $C^k$  ( $k=0; 1$ ) families of  $C^\infty$  smooth Hamiltonians  $H_t$  in  $\mathbb{T}^n \times D$  with parameters  $\omega \in \Omega$  where  $H_t$  are small perturbations of the normal form  $\mathcal{N}(I; \omega) := \langle \omega, I \rangle$ . The proof of the theorem, especially of the so called K.A.M. step follows that of J. Pöschel [47] in the case of analytic Hamiltonians but it requires additional work in order to adapt it to the case of  $C^k$  families of Hamiltonians  $[0, 1] \ni t \rightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^n \times D; \Omega)$ . For this reason we give a complete proof of the theorem. Using Theorem 10.1 we obtain a K.A.M. theorem for  $C^1$  families of Hamiltonians  $H_t$  which are perturbations of a given  $C^1$  family of completely integrable nondegenerate in Kolmogorov sense Hamiltonians  $H_t^0$ . The family  $H_t^0$  is given as follows. We consider a  $C^1$  family of nondegenerate real valued functions  $K_t \in C^\infty(\Omega)$ ,  $t \in [0, \delta]$ , in a domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , where by nondegenerate we mean that the gradient map

$$\Omega \ni t \mapsto \nabla K_t \in D_t := \nabla K_t(D_t)$$

is a diffeomorphism for each  $t \in [0, \delta]$ . We denote by  $H_t^0 \in C^\infty(D_t)$  the Legendre transform  $K_t^*$  of  $K_t$  given by

$$H_t^0(I) = K_t^*(I) := \text{Crit.val.}_{\omega \in \Omega} \{ \langle \omega, I \rangle - K_t(\omega) \}.$$

Then  $H_t^0 \in C^\infty(D_t)$  is nondegenerate and  $(H_t^0)^* = K_t$ . Theorem 9.1 provides a result of K.A.M. type for  $C^k$  families of Hamiltonians  $[0, \delta] \ni t \mapsto H_t \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^n \times D_t)$  which is a small perturbation of the family  $H_t^0$ . The constant  $\epsilon$  in the smallness condition essentially depends only on the dimension  $n$  and on the exponent  $\tau > n - 1$  in the Diophantine condition (1.3). To this end, given  $\omega \in \Omega$  we linearize  $H_t^0$  at  $I = \nabla H_t^{0*}(\omega)$  applying Taylor's formula and sending the nonlinear part of it to the perturbation. The smallness condition and the estimates in Theorem 9.1 are given in terms of suitable weighted Hölder norms. In order to obtain estimates of the Hölder norms with universal constants we suppose that  $\Omega$  is a strictly convex bounded set in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and that  $H_t^{0*}$ ,  $t \in [0, \delta]$ , is a  $C^k$  family with values in  $C^\infty(\overline{\Omega}, \mathbb{R})$ ,  $\overline{\Omega}$  being the closure of  $\Omega$ . Then one can extend the family  $H_t^{0*}$  to a  $C^k$  family of functions in  $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R})$  with a compact support using a suitable Whitney extension theorem. The idea is to use the interpolation inequalities for Hölder norms in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  or in  $\mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$  which simplify a lot the estimates of higher order Hölder norms for the inverse function and for the composition of functions. The problem about the composition of functions in Hölder spaces is quite delicate. It has been investigated recently by R. de la Llave and R. Obaya [36]. We can not use directly their results here since we need estimates with universal constants. These estimates are obtained in Appendix A.2.

Theorem 9.4 is a counterpart of Theorem 10.1 in the discrete case for  $C^1$  families of exact symplectic maps  $P_t$ . Theorem 9.4 is obtained from Theorem 10.1 using an idea of R. Douady [9]. The BNF of  $C^k$  families of exact symplectic maps at  $C^k$  families of Kronecker tori is obtained in Section 9.4. We point out that the constant  $\epsilon$  in the corresponding smallness conditions (9.179) and (9.185) essentially depend only on the dimension and on the exponent  $\tau$ . Moreover, the constants  $C_m$  in the corresponding Hölder estimates (9.180), (9.186) and (9.187) are universal. This makes these results especially useful in the case when the symplectic maps  $P_t$  have singularities. They can be applied for example for the billiard ball map  $B_t$  near the

singular set  $S_t^*\Gamma$  in the case when  $(X, g_t)$  is locally strictly geodesically convex and  $\dim X = 2$  (see Theorem 5.2).

## Part I

# Isospectral invariants and rigidity

## 2 Main Results

Before formulating the main results we recall from Birkhoff [2] (see also [64]) the definition of the billiard ball map  $B$  associated to a billiard table  $(X, g)$  with a smooth boundary  $\Gamma$ .

### 2.1 Billiard ball map

Let  $(X, g)$  be a smooth billiard table with boundary  $\Gamma$ . The “broken geodesic flow” given by the elastic reflection of geodesics hitting transversely the boundary induces a discrete dynamical system at the boundary which can be described as follows.

Denote by  $h$  the Hamiltonian on  $T^*X$  corresponding to the Riemannian metric  $g$  on  $X$  via the Legendre transformation and by  $h^0$  the Hamiltonian on  $T^*\Gamma$  corresponding to the induced Riemannian metric on  $\Gamma$ . The billiard ball map  $B$  lives in an open subset of the open coball bundle  $\mathbf{B}^*\Gamma = \{(x, \xi) \in T^*\Gamma : h^0(x, \xi) < 1\}$ . It is defined as follows. Denote by  $S^*X := \{(x, \xi) \in T^*X : h(x, \xi) = 1\}$  the cosphere bundle, and set

$$\Sigma = S^*X|_\Gamma := \{(x, \xi) \in S^*X : x \in \Gamma\} \text{ and } \Sigma^\pm := \{(x, \xi) \in \Sigma : \pm \langle \xi, \nu(x) \rangle > 0\}$$

where  $\nu(x) \in T_x X$ ,  $x \in \Gamma$ , is the outward unit normal to  $\Gamma$  with respect to the metric  $g$ . Let  $\overline{\mathbf{B}^*\Gamma}$  be closed coball bundle, i.e. the closure of  $\mathbf{B}^*\Gamma$  in  $T^*\Gamma$ . Consider the natural projection  $\pi_\Sigma : \Sigma \rightarrow \overline{\mathbf{B}^*\Gamma}$  assigning to each  $(x, \eta) \in \Sigma$  the covector  $(x, \eta|_{T_x \Gamma})$ . Its restriction to  $\Sigma^+ \cup \Sigma^-$  admits two smooth inverses

$$\pi_\Sigma^\pm : \mathbf{B}^*\Gamma \rightarrow \Sigma^\pm, \quad \pi_\Sigma^\pm(x, \xi) = (x, \xi^\pm). \quad (2.13)$$

The maps  $\pi_\Sigma^\pm$  can be extended continuously on the closed coball bundle  $\overline{\mathbf{B}^*\Gamma}$ . Given  $\varrho^\pm \in \Sigma^\pm$  we consider the integral curve  $\exp(sX_h)(\varrho)$  of the Hamiltonian vector field  $X_h$  starting at  $\varrho$ . If it intersects  $\Sigma$  transversely at a time  $T = T(\varrho)$  and lies entirely in the interior of  $S^*X$  for  $t$  between 0 and  $T$  we set

$$J(\varrho^\pm) = \exp(TX_h)(\varrho^\pm) \in \Sigma^\mp.$$

Notice that  $J$  is a smooth involution defined in an open dense subset of  $\Sigma$ . In this way we obtain a smooth exact symplectic map  $B : \widetilde{\mathbf{B}^*\Gamma} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}^*\Gamma$ , given by  $B = \pi_\Sigma \circ J \circ \pi_\Sigma^+$ , where  $\widetilde{\mathbf{B}^*\Gamma}$  is an open dense subset of  $\mathbf{B}^*\Gamma$ . The map  $J$  can be extended to a smooth involution of  $\Sigma$  in the case when  $X$  is a strictly convex billiard table in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . In this case the billiard ball map is well defined and smooth in  $\mathbf{B}^*\Gamma$  and can be extended by continuity as the identity map on its boundary  $S^*\Gamma$ . This case will be considered in more details in Sect. 5.

Suppose now that  $t \rightarrow g_t$  is a  $C^1$  family of Riemannian metrics on  $X$ . For any  $t$  we denote the corresponding cosphere bundle by  $S_t^*X := \{h_t = 1\}$  and the corresponding open coball bundle of  $\Gamma$  by  $\mathbf{B}_t^*\Gamma := \{h_t^0 < 1\}$ . Let  $\pi_t : \Sigma_t \rightarrow \overline{\mathbf{B}_t^*\Gamma}$  be the natural projection and  $\pi_t^\pm :$

$\mathbf{B}_t^* \Gamma \rightarrow \Sigma_t^\pm$ ,  $\pi_{\Sigma_t}^\pm(x, \xi) = (x, \xi_t^\pm)$  its inverses. Denote by  $J_t$  the corresponding involution in  $\Sigma_t$  and consider the billiard ball map  $B_t : \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_t^* \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_t^* \Gamma$ . If  $(x, \xi) \in \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_{t_0}^* \Gamma$ , then  $(x, \xi) \in \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_t^* \Gamma$  for any  $t$  in a neighborhood of  $t_0$  because of the transversality and one can show that the map  $t \rightarrow B_t \in C^\infty(\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_t^* \Gamma, \mathbf{B}_t^* \Gamma)$  is  $C^1$ . In this way we obtain a  $C^1$  family of symplectic mappings  $t \rightarrow (B_t : \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_t^* \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_t^* \Gamma)$ .

## 2.2 Main Results

Recall that  $P_0$  admits a  $C^\infty$  Birkhoff normal form at any Kronecker invariant torus  $\Lambda_0(\omega)$  with a Diophantine frequency  $\omega$  (cf [37], Proposition 9.13). The Birkhoff normal form of  $P_0$  at  $\Lambda_0(\omega)$  is said to be nondegenerate if the quadratic part of it is a nondegenerate quadratic form. The nondegeneracy of the Birkhoff normal form enables one to apply the K.A.M. theorem.

**Theorem 1** *Let  $(X, g_t)$ ,  $t \in [0, 1]$ , be a  $C^1$  family of billiard tables. Let  $\Lambda_0(\omega_0) \subset \mathbf{B}_0^* \Gamma$  be a Kronecker invariant torus of  $P_0 := B_0^m$  of a Diophantine frequency  $\omega_0 \in D(\kappa_0, \tau)$ . Suppose that the Birkhoff normal form of  $P_0$  at  $\Lambda_0(\omega_0)$  is nondegenerate. Then there exists  $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\kappa_0) > 0$  such that the following holds.*

1. *There exists a  $C^1$ -family of Kronecker invariant tori*

$$[0, \delta_0] \ni t \rightarrow \Lambda_t(\omega_0) \subset \mathbf{B}_t^* \Gamma$$

*of  $P_t := B_t^m$  of a frequency  $\omega_0$ .*

2. *For any  $0 < \delta < \delta_0$  there exists a set  $\Xi \subset \mathbb{T}^{n-1}$  of Diophantine frequencies such that  $\omega_0 \in \Xi$ ,*

$$\frac{\text{meas}(B(\omega_0, \varepsilon) \cap \Xi)}{\text{meas}(B(\omega_0, \varepsilon))} = 1 - O_\delta(\varepsilon) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0,$$

*and for any  $\omega \in \Xi$  there exists a  $C^1$ -family of Kronecker invariant tori*

$$[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow \Lambda_t(\omega) \subset \mathbf{B}_t^* \Gamma$$

*of  $P_t := B_t^m$  of a frequency  $\omega$ .*

3. *If the billiard tables satisfy the weak isospectral condition  $(H_1) - (H_2)$  then  $\beta_t(\omega)$ ,  $I_t(\omega)$  and  $L_t(I_t(\omega))$  are independent of  $t \in [0, \delta]$  for any  $\omega \in \Xi$ .*

We are going to apply this result for  $C^1$  deformations of the boundary keeping the Riemannian metric fixed. Let  $X$  be a smooth compact manifold of dimension  $n \geq 2$  with non-empty boundary  $\Gamma := \partial X$  which is smoothly embedded into a Riemannian manifold  $(\tilde{X}, g)$  of the same dimension and without boundary. We say that  $(X_t, g)$ ,  $t \in [0, \varepsilon]$ , is a  $C^1$  variation of  $(X, g)$  if  $(X_t, g)$  is a billiard table in  $(\tilde{X}, g)$  with boundary  $\Gamma_t = \partial X_t$ ,  $X_0 = X$ , and if there exists a  $C^1$  family of embeddings

$$[0, \varepsilon] \ni t \rightarrow \psi_t \in C^\infty(\Gamma, \tilde{X}) \tag{2.14}$$

such that  $\psi_t(\Gamma) = \Gamma_t$ . In this case we say that  $(X_t, g)$  is a  $C^1$  family of billiard tables. Then there exists a  $C^1$  family of diffeomorphisms onto their images  $[0, \varepsilon] \ni t \rightarrow \Psi_t \in C^\infty(X, \tilde{X})$  such that  $\Psi_t(X) = X_t$ ,  $\Psi_t|_\Gamma = \psi_t$ , and  $\Psi_t$  is identity outside an open neighborhood of  $\Gamma$  in  $X$ . The family  $\Psi_t$  can be constructed parameterizing a neighborhood of  $\Gamma$  in  $\tilde{X}$  by the exponential map

$(x, s) \mapsto \exp_x(s\nu(x))$  corresponding to the Riemannian metric  $g = g_0$  in  $\tilde{X}$ , where  $\nu(x)$  is the outward unit normal to  $\Gamma$ . In particular, we get a family of billiard tables  $(X_t, g)$ ,  $t \in [0, \varepsilon]$ , which are isometric to  $(X, g_t)$ ,  $g_t := \Psi_t^* g$ . We say that a family of Kronecker invariant tori  $[0, \delta) \ni t \rightarrow \Lambda_t(\omega) \subset \mathbf{B}^* \Gamma_t$  is  $C^1$ -smooth if the family  $[0, \delta) \ni t \rightarrow \psi_t^*(\Lambda_t(\omega)) \subset \mathbf{B}^* \Gamma$  is  $C^1$ . Consider the corresponding Laplace-Beltrami operator  $\Delta_t$  in  $(X_t, g)$  with Dirichlet, Neumann or Robin boundary conditions on  $\Gamma_t$ . As a corollary of the main theorem we obtain

**Theorem 2** *Let  $(X_t, g)$ ,  $t \in [0, 1]$ , be a  $C^1$  family of billiard tables. Let  $\Lambda_0(\omega_0) \subset \mathbf{B}^* \Gamma$  be a Kronecker invariant torus of  $P_0 := B_0^m$  of a Diophantine frequency  $\omega_0 \in D(\kappa_0, \tau)$ . Suppose that the Birkhoff normal form of  $P_0$  at  $\Lambda_0(\omega_0)$  is non-degenerate. Then there exists  $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\kappa_0) > 0$  such that the following holds.*

1. *There exists a  $C^1$ -family of Kronecker invariant tori*

$$[0, \delta_0) \ni t \rightarrow \Lambda_t(\omega_0) \subset \mathbf{B}^* \Gamma_t$$

*of  $P_t := B_t^m$  of a frequency  $\omega_0$ .*

2. *For any  $0 < \delta < \delta_0$  there exists a set  $\Xi \subset \mathbb{T}^{n-1}$  of Diophantine frequencies such that  $\omega_0 \in \Xi$ ,*

$$\frac{\text{meas}(B(\omega_0, \varepsilon) \cap \Xi)}{\text{meas}(B(\omega_0, \varepsilon))} = 1 - O_\delta(\varepsilon) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0,$$

*and for any  $\omega \in \Xi$  there exists a  $C^1$ -family of Kronecker invariant tori*

$$[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow \Lambda_t(\omega) \subset \mathbf{B}^* \Gamma_t$$

*of  $P_t := B_t^m$  of a frequency  $\omega$ .*

3. *If the billiard tables satisfy the weak isospectral condition  $(H_1) - (H_2)$  then  $\beta_t(\omega)$ ,  $I_t(\omega)$  and  $L_t(I_t(\omega))$  are independent of  $t \in [0, \delta]$  for any  $\omega \in \Xi$ .*

We shall denote by  $\delta_\nu \Gamma_t : \Gamma_t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  the vertical component of the variation  $\Gamma_s$  of  $\Gamma_t$  which is defined by

$$\forall x \in \Gamma_t, \quad \delta_\nu \Gamma_t(x) := \left\langle \dot{\psi}_t(\psi_t^{-1}(x)), \nu_t(x) \right\rangle = \left\langle \frac{d\psi_s}{ds} \Big|_{s=t}(\psi_t^{-1}(x)), \nu_t(x) \right\rangle, \quad (2.15)$$

where  $\nu_t(x)$  is the outward unit normal to  $\Gamma_t$  at  $x$  with respect to the metric  $g$ .

Let  $\pi_t : T^* \Gamma_t \rightarrow \Gamma_t$  be the natural projection. Given  $\zeta = (x, \xi) \in B^* \Gamma_t$ , we denote by  $\xi_t^+(\zeta) \in T_x^* X$  the corresponding outgoing unit covector which means that the restriction of the covector  $\xi_t^+$  to  $T_x \Gamma_t$  equals  $\xi$ ,  $h_t(\xi_t^+) = 1$ , and  $\langle \xi_t^+(\zeta), \nu_t(\pi_t(\zeta)) \rangle_x \geq 0$ , where  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_x$  stands for the pairing between covectors in  $T_x^* X$  with vectors in  $T_x X$  (see Sect. 2.1). In this case the second part of Corollary 2 can be stated as follows.

**Theorem 3** *Let  $(X_t, g)$ ,  $t \in [0, \varepsilon]$ , be a  $C^1$ -family of billiard tables satisfying the isospectral condition  $(H_1) - (H_2)$ . Let  $[0, \delta) \ni t \rightarrow \Lambda_t(\omega)$ ,  $0 < \delta \leq \varepsilon$ , be a  $C^1$  family of invariant tori of  $P_t = B_t^m$  with a Diophantine vector of rotation  $\omega$ . Then*

$$\sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \int_{\Lambda_t(\omega)} \left( \left\langle \xi_t^+(\zeta), \nu_t(\pi_t(\zeta)) \right\rangle (\delta_\nu \Gamma_t)(\pi_t(\zeta)) \right) \Big|_{\zeta=B_t^j(\rho)} d\mu_t(\rho) = 0 \quad (2.16)$$

*for any  $t \in [0, \delta)$ .*

There are three particular cases we will focus our attention at, namely,  $C^1$  deformations of nondegenerate Liouville billiard tables, deformations of a manifold having non-degenerate elliptic periodic geodesics and deformations of strictly convex planar domains.

Consider a strictly convex billiard table  $X$  in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . Lazutkin has proved that any fixed  $\tau > 1$  and any  $0 < \kappa < \kappa_0 \ll 1$  there is a subset  $\Omega_\kappa \subset D(\kappa, \tau)$  of positive Lebesgue measure consisting  $(\kappa, \tau)$ -Diophantine frquences such that for any  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa$  there is a Kronecker invariant circle  $\Lambda(\omega)$  of the billiard ball map  $B$  of a frequency  $\omega$  (see [37] and the references there). Morreover, the corresponding caustic  $\mathcal{C}(\omega)$  - the envelope of the rays issuing from  $\Lambda(\omega)$  - is a closed smooth convex curve lying in the interior of  $X$ . As  $\kappa$  tends to 0 the invariant curves accumulate at the boundary  $S^*(\Gamma)$  of  $\mathbf{B}^*(\Gamma)$ .

**Theorem 4** *Let  $X_t \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ ,  $t \in [0, 1]$ , be a  $C^1$  family of compact billiard tables satisfying the weak isospectral condition  $(H_1) - (H_2)$ . Suppose that  $X_0$  is strictly convex. Then*

1.  $X_t$  is strictly convex for each  $t \in [0, 1]$
2. There is a Cantor set  $\Xi \subset (0, 1]$  consisting of Diophantine numbers such that

$$\text{meas}(\Xi \cap (0, \varepsilon)) = \varepsilon(1 - O(\varepsilon)) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$$

and such that  $\forall \omega \in \Xi$  there is a  $C^1$  family of Kronecker invariant circles  $[0, 1] \ni t \rightarrow \Lambda_t(\omega)$  of  $B_t$  of frequency  $\omega$ ,

3.  $\forall \omega \in \Xi$  and  $t \in [0, 1]$ ,  $\beta_t(\omega) = \beta_0(\omega)$ ,  $L_t(I_0(\omega)) = L_0(I_0(\omega))$ , and  $I_t(\omega) = I_0(\omega)$ .

### 2.3 Proof of Theorem 3

Theorem 3 follows from Theorem 2 and the following statement.

**Proposition 2.1** *Let  $[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow \Lambda_t(\omega) \subset \mathbf{B}^*\Gamma_t$  be a  $C^1$  family of invariant tori of  $P_t = B_t^m$  with a frequency  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$ . Then*

$$\frac{d}{dt}\beta_t(\omega) = -\frac{2}{\mu_t(\Lambda_t(\omega))} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \int_{\Lambda_t(\omega)} (\delta_\nu \Gamma_t)(\pi_t(\zeta)) \left\langle \xi_t^+(\zeta), \nu_t(\pi_t(\zeta)) \right\rangle \Big|_{\zeta=B_t^j(\rho)} d\mu_t(\rho) \quad (2.17)$$

for each  $t \in [0, \delta]$  and  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$ .

We are going to use the following

**Lemma 2.2.** *Consider a  $C^1$  family of curves  $c : (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \times [0, l] \rightarrow X$ ,  $c_s(\cdot) \equiv c(s, \cdot) : [0, l] \rightarrow X$ , such that  $c(\theta) := c_0(\theta)$  is a geodesic of the metric  $g$  and denote by  $l(s) := l_g(c_s)$  the length of the curve  $c_s(\cdot) : [0, l] \rightarrow X$  with respect to the metric  $g$ . Then*

$$\frac{dl}{ds}(0) = -g\left(\frac{\dot{c}_0(0)}{\|\dot{c}_0(0)\|_g}, \frac{\partial c}{\partial s}(0, 0)\right) + g\left(\frac{\dot{c}_0(l)}{\|\dot{c}_0(l)\|_g}, \frac{\partial c}{\partial s}(0, l)\right),$$

where  $\dot{c}_0(\theta) := \frac{dc}{d\theta}(0, \theta)$ .

*Proof.* The Lemma follows from a straightforward differentiation of the length function  $l(s)$  and the Euler-Lagrange equation.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 2.2.* Using the notations introduced just before Theorem 2 we set  $p(\theta, t) := f_t(\theta)$ ,  $\theta \in \mathbb{T}^{n-1}$ , where  $f_t \equiv f_{t,\omega} : \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}^*\Gamma_t$  is the embedding of the Kronecker torus  $\Lambda_t(\omega) \subset \mathbf{B}^*\Gamma_t$ . Consider the function  $x : \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times [0, \delta] \rightarrow \Gamma_t$  given by

$$x(\theta, t) := \pi_t(p(\theta, t)) = \psi(\pi_0(\tilde{f}_t(\theta)), t). \quad (2.18)$$

where  $\tilde{f}_t(\theta) := \psi_t^*(f_t(\theta))$ . Clearly,  $x \in C^1(\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times [0, \delta], \tilde{X})$  and  $x(\theta, 0) = \pi_0(f_0(\theta))$  for any  $\theta \in \mathbb{T}^{n-1}$ . Suppose first that  $m = 1$ , that means that  $P_t = B_t$ . By (1.5) we have

$$\beta_s(\omega) = -\frac{1}{(2\pi)^{n-1}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{n-1}} l(x(\theta, s), x(R_{2\pi\omega}(\theta), s)) d\theta$$

where  $l(x, x')$  is the corresponding length function which is well defined and smooth in a neighborhood of the projection of  $\Lambda_t(\omega) \times \Lambda_t(\omega)$  in  $\tilde{X} \times \tilde{X}$ .

First we prove (2.17) for  $t = 0$ . Setting  $\tilde{\theta} := R_{2\pi\omega}(\theta)$  and using Lemma 2.2 we get

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{d}{ds}\Big|_{s=0} \beta_s(\omega) &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{n-1}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{n-1}} \left[ \frac{d}{ds} l(x(\theta, s), x(R_{2\pi\omega}(\theta), s)) \right] \Big|_{s=0} d\theta \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{n-1}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{n-1}} \left[ \left\langle \pi_{\Sigma_s}^+(p(\tilde{\theta}, s)), \frac{\partial x}{\partial s}(\tilde{\theta}, s) \right\rangle - \left\langle \pi_{\Sigma_s}^-(p(\theta, s)), \frac{\partial x}{\partial s}(\theta, s) \right\rangle \right] \Big|_{s=0} d\theta \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{n-1}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{n-1}} \left\langle (\pi_{\Sigma}^+ - \pi_{\Sigma}^-)(p(\theta, 0)), \frac{\partial x}{\partial t}(\theta, 0) \right\rangle d\theta \\ &= \frac{2}{(2\pi)^{n-1}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{n-1}} \left\langle \pi_{\Sigma}^+(f_0(\theta)), \nu(x(\theta, 0)) \right\rangle g\left(\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t}(\pi_0(f_0(\theta)), 0), \nu(\pi_0(f_0(\theta)))\right) d\theta. \end{aligned}$$

where  $\pi_{\Sigma_s}^{\pm} : \mathbf{B}^*\Gamma_s \rightarrow \Sigma_s^{\pm}$  is the map defined in (2.13). In the variables  $(x, \xi) = f_0(\theta)$ , we get

$$\frac{d}{ds}\Big|_{s=0} \beta_s(\omega) = -\frac{2}{\mu_0(\Lambda_0(\omega))} \int_{\Lambda_0(\omega)} \langle \xi^+(\xi), \nu(\pi_0(\xi)) \rangle (\delta_{\nu}\Gamma)(\pi_0(\xi)) d\mu_0,$$

where  $\delta_{\nu}\Gamma(x) = \langle \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t}(x, 0), \nu(x) \rangle$ . The same argument holds for  $m \geq 2$ . Finally, to prove (2.17) for any  $t \in [0, \delta]$  we replace  $\Gamma_0$  by  $\Gamma_t$  and apply the same arguments.  $\square$

### 3 Infinitesimal spectral rigidity of Liouville billiard tables

A Liouville billiard table of dimension  $n \geq 2$ , is a completely integrable billiard table  $(X, g)$  admitting  $n$  functionally independent and Poisson commuting integrals of the billiard flow on  $T^*X$  which are quadratic forms in the momentum. It can be viewed as a  $2^{n-1}$ -folded branched covering of a disk-like domain in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  by the cylinder  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times [-N, N]$ ,  $N > 0$ .

Liouville billiard tables of dimension two were defined in [53, Sec. 2] by using a branched double covering map. Here we give an invariant definition of Liouville billiard tables in dimension two. The equivalence of the two definitions is proven in Appendix B.1.

**Definition 3.1** *A Liouville billiard table is a smooth oriented compact and connected Riemannian manifold of dimension two  $(X, g)$  with connected boundary  $\Gamma \equiv \partial X$  such that the following two conditions are satisfied:*

- (a) *There exists a smooth quadratic in velocities integral of the geodesic flow  $I : TX \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that is invariant with respect to the reflection at the boundary  $TM|_\Gamma \rightarrow TM|_\Gamma$ ,  $\xi \mapsto \xi - 2g(\nu, \xi)$ , where  $\nu$  is the outward unit normal to  $\Gamma$ . In addition, we assume that the metric  $g$  does not allow global Killing symmetries;*
- (b) *There is no point  $x_0 \in \Gamma$  and a constant  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $g_{x_0}(\xi, \xi) = cI_{x_0}(\xi, \xi)$  for any  $\xi \in T_{x_0}X$ .*

In view of Theorem 5 in Appendix B.1 there exists a double covering map with two branched points,

$$\tau : C \rightarrow X, \quad (3.19)$$

where  $C$  denotes the cylinder  $(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}) \times [-N, N]$ ,  $N > 0$ , coordinatized by the variables  $x$  and  $y$  respectively, so that the metric  $\tau^*(g)$  and the integral  $\tau^*(I)$  have the following form on  $C$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} dg^2 &= (f(x) - q(y))(dx^2 + dy^2) \\ dI^2 &= \alpha dF^2 + \beta dg^2 \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

where  $\alpha \neq 0$  and  $\beta$  are real constants and

$$dF^2 := (f(x) - q(y))(q(y) dx^2 + f(x) dy^2). \quad (3.21)$$

In other words, the integral  $dI^2$  belongs to the pencil of  $dg^2$  and  $dF^2$ . Here  $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  is 1-periodic,  $q \in C^\infty([-N, N])$ , and

- (i)  $f$  is even,  $f > 0$  if  $x \notin \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ , and  $f(0) = f(1/2) = 0$ ;
- (ii)  $q$  is even,  $q < 0$  if  $y \neq 0$ ,  $q(0) = 0$  and  $q''(0) < 0$ ;
- (iii)  $f^{(2k)}(l/2) = (-1)^k q^{(2k)}(0)$ ,  $l = 0, 1$ , for every natural  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

In particular, if  $f \sim \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} f_k x^{2k}$  is the Taylor expansion of  $f$  at 0, then, by (iii), the Taylor expansion of  $q$  at 0 is  $q \sim \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (-1)^k f_k x^{2k}$ . A Liouville billiard table is said to be *of classical type* if it satisfies the following additional conditions,

- (iv) the boundary  $\Gamma$  of  $X$  is locally geodesically convex which amounts to  $q'(N) < 0$ ;
- (v)  $f(x) = f(1/2 - x)$  for any  $x$  and  $f$  is strictly increasing on the interval  $[0, 1/4]$ ;

**Remark 3.2** *Note that in contrast to [53, Sec. 2] we do not assume that the functions  $f$  and  $g$  are analytic Morse functions.*

The points  $F_1 := \tau(0, 0)$  and  $F_2 := \tau(1/2, 0)$  on  $X$  are the two branched points of the covering map  $\tau : C \rightarrow X$ . All other points on  $X$  are regular values of  $\tau$ . The preimage of any regular value consists of two points. Note also that  $\tau : C \rightarrow X$  commutes with the involution on the cylinder  $C$  induced by the map  $\sigma : (x, y) \mapsto (-x, -y)$ . The fixed points of this involution are precisely the singular points  $(0, 0)$  and  $(1/2, 0)$  of the covering map  $\tau$ . One can see that any Liouville

billiard table possesses the *string property* which means that any broken geodesic starting from the singular point  $F_1(F_2)$  passes through  $F_2(F_1)$  after the first reflection at the boundary and the sum of distances from any point of  $\Gamma$  to  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  is constant [53]. In particular, the only Liouville billiard table in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  equipped with the Euclidean metric is the interior of the ellipse. Thus Liouville billiard tables can be regarded as a natural generalization of elliptic billiards to curved space. In view of condition (v) in the definition of the Liouville billiard tables of classical type, there is a group  $I(X) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2$  acting on  $(X, g)$  by isometries. This group is generated by the involutions  $\sigma_1(x, y) = (x, -y)$  and  $\sigma_2(x, y) = (\pi - x, y)$  of the cylinder.

The construction of Liouville billiards of dimension two involving the covering map  $\tau$  was generalized to any dimension in [54, §5.3] (cf. also [55, §3]). As in the two dimensional case, one defines the subclass of Liouville billiards of classical type in a similar way. An important example of a Liouville billiard table of classical type is the interior of the  $n$ -axial ellipsoid in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  equipped with the Euclidean metric. More generally, there is a non-trivial two-parameter family of analytic Liouville billiard tables of classical type of constant scalar curvature  $K$  having the same broken geodesics (considered as non-parameterized curves) as the ellipsoid [54, Theorem 3]. This family includes the ellipsoid ( $K = 0$ ), and Liouville billiard tables on the sphere ( $K = 1$ ) and in the hyperbolic space ( $K = -1$ ).

In what follows we will apply Theorem 3 to Liouville billiard tables of classical type in dimensions two and three for obtaining several new isospectral results. The main idea is to interpret the integrals in (2.16) as values of a suitable Radon transform which is one-to-one.

Let  $(X, g)$  be a Liouville billiard table of classical type. The group of isometries of  $(X, g)$  has a subgroup  $I(X, g)$  isomorphic to  $(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^n$ . One can extend  $(X, g)$  to an open Riemannian manifold  $(M, g)$  so that any isometry in  $I(X, g)$  can be extended to an isometry of  $(M, g)$ . In this way, the group of isometries of  $(M, g)$  contains a subgroup  $I(M, g)$  isomorphic to  $I(X, g)$ . Denote by  $\text{Sym}(M, g)$  the class of  $C^\infty$ -smooth billiard tables  $(Y, g)$ ,  $Y$  isometrically embedded in  $M$ , so that any isometry in  $I(M, g)$  is an isometry of  $(Y, g)$ . Recall from Sec. 2 that  $\delta_\nu \Gamma : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the vertical component of the variation  $\dot{\psi}_0 : \Gamma \rightarrow TM|_\Gamma$ , where  $\psi_0 = id$  and  $\Gamma_t = \psi_t(\Gamma_0)$  is a  $C^1$ -deformation of  $\Gamma = \Gamma_0$  and  $(X_t, g)$  is the billiard table with boundary  $\Gamma_t = \partial X_t$ .

**Theorem 3.3** *Let  $(X, g)$  be a Liouville billiard table of classical type dimension 2 and let  $(X_t, g)$ ,  $t \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ , be a  $C^1$ -family of billiard tables in  $\text{Sym}(M, g)$  satisfying the weak isospectral condition  $(H_1) - (H_2)$  and such that  $X_0 = X$ . Then  $\delta_\nu \Gamma \equiv 0$ .*

This means that any Liouville billiard table of classical type  $(X, g)$  is *infinitesimally spectrally rigid* in  $\text{Sym}(M, g)$  under the weak-isospectral condition  $(H_1) - (H_2)$ .

*Proof of Theorem 3.3.* The theorem follows from Theorem 2 as in the proof of Corollary 1.4 in [56]. A first integral of  $B$  in  $B^*\Gamma$  is the function  $\mathcal{I}(x, \xi) = f(x) - \xi^2$  the regular values  $h$  of which belong to  $(q(N), 0) \cup (0, f(1/4))$  (see [53], Lemma 4.1 and Proposition 4.2). Moreover, for each regular value  $h \in (q(N), 0)$  the corresponding level set  $L_h : \{\mathcal{I} = h\}$  consists of two connected circles which are invariant with respect to  $B$ , having rotation numbers  $\omega = \pm \rho(h)$ . By Proposition 4.4 [53], the rotation function  $\rho$  is smooth and strictly increasing in an interval  $(q(N), q(N) + \varepsilon)$ , and we obtain a diffeomorphism  $\rho : (q(N), q(N) + \varepsilon) \rightarrow (0, \omega_0)$ . Then the Kolmogorov non-degeneracy condition is satisfied in that interval. Hence, one can apply Corollary 2 to any Kronecker invariant circle  $\Lambda_0(\omega)$ , with a Diophantine vector of rotation  $\omega = \rho(h) \in (0, \omega_0)$ .

We are going to interpret (2.16) as a value of a suitable Radon transform. The Leray form on the invariant circle  $\Lambda_0(\omega) \subset L_h$  is

$$\lambda_h = \begin{cases} \frac{dx}{\sqrt{f(x)-h}}, & \xi > 0, \\ -\frac{dx}{\sqrt{f(x)-h}}, & \xi < 0. \end{cases}$$

Since  $\omega \in (0, \omega_0)$  is Diophantine and the Leray form is invariant with respect to  $B$ , there exists a constant  $c(h) \neq 0$  such that  $\lambda_h = c(h)d\mu_0$ , where  $d\mu_0$  is the unique probability measure on  $\Lambda_0(\omega)$  which is invariant with respect to  $B$ . Setting  $K := \pi_{\Gamma_t}^*(\delta_\nu \Gamma_t)$  we consider the corresponding Radon transform which assigns to each circle  $\Lambda_0(\omega) := \{(x, y(h)) : x \in \mathbb{T}\}$ ,  $h = \rho^{-1}(\omega)$ , the integral

$$R_K(\Lambda_0(\omega)) = \int_{\Lambda_0(\omega)} \langle \xi^\pm, \nu \rangle K \circ \pi_\Gamma \lambda_h.$$

We have

$$\langle \xi^\pm(x, y(h)), \nu(x) \rangle = \sqrt{\frac{h - q(N)}{f(x) - q(N)}},$$

hence,

$$R_K(\Lambda_0(\omega)) = \pm c(h) \sqrt{h - q(N)} \int_0^1 \frac{K_1(x)}{\sqrt{f(x) - h}} dx, \quad h \in (q(N), 0),$$

where  $K_1(x) = K(x)/\sqrt{f(x) - q(N)}$ . Since  $K$  is invariant with respect to the group of isometries  $I(X)$  then so is  $K_1$  and applying (2.16) for  $t = 0$  we get

$$0 = \int_0^{1/4} \frac{K_1(x)}{\sqrt{f(x) - h}} dx = \int_0^{f(1/4)} \frac{K_2(s)}{\sqrt{s - h}} ds \quad (3.22)$$

for any  $h \in (q(N), q(N) + \varepsilon)$  such that  $\rho(h) \in D(\kappa, \tau)$ , where  $K_2 = (K_1/f') \circ f^{-1} \in L^1(0, f(1/4))$ . On the other hand, the right hand side of (3.22) is analytic in  $h \in (q(N), 0)$  and the set of  $h = \rho^{-1}(\omega)$ ,  $\omega \in D(\kappa, \tau) \cap (0, \omega_0)$  is of positive measure, and we obtain (3.22) for any  $h \in (q(N), 0)$ . Differentiating (3.22) with respect to  $h$  at  $h = q(N)$  we get

$$\int_0^{f(1/4)} \frac{K_2(s)}{\sqrt{s - q(N)}} (s - q(N))^{-k} ds = 0$$

for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , which implies  $K_2 = 0$  since the set  $\{(s - q(N))^{-k} : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is dense in  $L^1(0, f(1/4))$  and  $K_2$  is continuous in  $(0, f(1/4))$ . This completes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

In order to apply Theorem 2 to Liouville billiard tables of dimension three we need to ensure that the following Kolmogorov non-degeneracy condition is satisfied. Consider a Liouville-Arnold chart which consists of an open set  $U$  of the phase space of the billiard ball map  $B$  and a symplectic map  $(\varphi, I) : U \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n \times D$ ,  $D$  being an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , giving “action-angle” coordinates on  $U$ , i.e.  $B$  is given by the map  $(\varphi, I) \mapsto (\varphi + \nabla K(I), I)$  in these coordinates. The

Kolmogorov condition means that the map  $\nabla K : D \rightarrow D^* := \nabla K(D)$  is a diffeomorphism. We are interested in maximal charts with this property. It turns out that Liouville billiard tables of classical type of dimension two are always non-degenerate in a Kolmogorov sense close to the boundary [53]. The non-degeneracy property of Liouville billiard tables of classical type of dimension three has been investigated in [55].

It is proved in [55] that any Liouville Billiard Table of classical type of dimension 3 admits four not necessarily connected maximal Liouville-Arnold charts  $U_j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq 4$ , of action-angle variables in  $B^*\Gamma$ . Two of them, say  $U_1$  and  $U_2$ , have the property that any unparameterized geodesic in  $S^*\Gamma$  can be obtained as a limit of orbits of  $B$  lying either in  $U_1$  or in  $U_2$  (then the corresponding broken geodesics approximate geodesics of the boundary). Moreover, in any connected component of  $U_1$  and  $U_2$  there is such a sequence of orbits of  $B$ , while any orbit of  $B$  in  $U_3$  and  $U_4$  is far away from  $S^*\Gamma$ . In other words, the charts  $U_1$  and  $U_2$  can be characterized by the property that there is a family of “*whispering gallery rays*” issuing from any of their connected components. For this reason the two cases  $j = 1, 2$  are referred as to boundary cases. Denote by  $\mathcal{F}_b$  the set of all regular invariant tori  $\Lambda \in \mathcal{F}$  lying either in  $U_1$  or in  $U_2$ . We say that a Liouville Billiard Table is non-degenerate if  $B$  satisfies the Kolmogorov non-degeneracy condition in  $U_1$  and  $U_2$ . It is shown in [55], Theorem 5.1, that any analytic 3-dimensional Liouville billiard table of classical type having at least one non-periodic geodesic on the boundary is non-degenerate. An example of such billiard tables is the ellipsoid.

Using Corollary 2 and [55], Theorem 4.1, we obtain as above the following

**Theorem 3.4** *Any non-degenerate Liouville billiard table of dimension 3 of classical type  $(X, g)$  is infinitesimally spectrally rigid in  $\text{Symm}(M, g)$  under the weak-isospectral condition  $(H_1) - (H_2)$ .*

This means that if  $(X_t, g)$ ,  $t \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$  is a  $C^1$ -family of billiard tables in  $\text{Symm}(M, g)$  satisfying the weak isospectral condition  $(H_1) - (H_2)$  and such that  $X_0 = X$ , then  $\delta_\nu \Gamma \equiv 0$ .

A smooth deformation  $(X_t, g)$ ,  $t \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ , is said to be flat at  $t = 0$  if (2.14) is  $C^\infty$  smooth with respect to  $t$  in an interval  $(-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$  and the vertical component of  $k$ -th variation  $\delta_\nu^k \Gamma$  is zero for any integer  $k \geq 1$ , where

$$\delta_\nu^k \Gamma(x) := \left\langle \left( \frac{d}{dt} \right)^k \psi_t|_{t=0}(x), \nu(x) \right\rangle, \quad x \in \Gamma.$$

**Corollary 3.5** *Let  $(X, g)$  be a classical Liouville billiard table of dimension 2 or a classical non-degenerate Liouville billiard table of dimension 3 and let  $(X_t, g)$ ,  $t \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ , be a  $C^\infty$ -family of billiard tables in  $\text{Symm}(M, g)$  satisfying the weak isospectral condition  $(H_1) - (H_2)$  and such that  $X_0 = X$ . Then the deformation is flat at  $t = 0$ . In particular,  $\Gamma_t = \Gamma_0$  for  $t \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$  if the family is analytic with respect to  $t$ .*

In the case of the ellipse similar results have been obtained by Hezari and Zelditch [21] under the usual isospectral condition using the wave-trace method.

## 4 Isospectral deformations in the presence of elliptic geodesics.

Let  $(X, g)$  be a smooth billiard table with boundary  $\Gamma := \partial X$ . Consider a  $C^1$ -smooth family

$$[0, 1] \ni t \rightarrow (X, g_t) \tag{4.23}$$

of Riemannian metrics on  $X$  with  $g_0 = g$ . Suppose that  $(X, g)$  admits an elliptic closed broken geodesic  $\gamma$  with  $m \geq 2$  vertices. Denote by  $\{B^j(\rho) : 0 \leq j \leq m-1\}$  the corresponding periodic trajectory of the billiard ball map  $B$ . Then  $\rho = (x, \xi) \in \mathbf{B}^*\Gamma$  is a fixed point of the local Poincaré map  $P = B^m$  which is symplectic. Recall that  $\gamma$  is *elliptic* if  $\rho$  is an *elliptic* fixed point of  $P$  which means that the eigenvalues of the linear Poincaré map  $dP(\rho) : T_\rho\Gamma \rightarrow T_\rho\Gamma$  are all distinct, different from one and of modulus one, hence,

$$\text{Spec}(dP(\rho)) = \{e^{\pm i\phi_j} : 1 \leq j \leq n-1\},$$

where  $0 < \phi_1 < \dots < \phi_{n-1} \leq \pi$ . Set  $\phi = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_{n-1})$  and fix a positive integer  $N$ . The linear Poincaré map  $dP(\rho)$  is said to be  $N$ -*elementary* if the scalar product

$$\langle \phi, k \rangle \notin 2\pi\mathbb{Z}$$

for any integer vector  $k = (k_1, \dots, k_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$  such that  $0 < |k_1| + \dots + |k_{n-1}| \leq N$ . We say as well that  $\gamma$  admits no resonances of order less or equal to  $N$ .

From now on we fix  $N \geq 4$  and suppose that  $\gamma_0 = \gamma$  is elliptic in  $(X, g_0)$  and that it admits no resonances of order less or equal to  $N$ . By the implicit function theorem there exists  $\bar{\delta} > 0$  such that the following holds. There is a unique  $C^1$  curve  $[0, \bar{\delta}) \ni t \mapsto \rho_t \in T^*\Gamma$  starting from  $\rho_0 = \rho$  such that  $\rho_t \in \mathbf{B}_t^*\Gamma$  is an elliptic fixed point of  $P_t = B_t^m$  for any  $t \in [0, \bar{\delta})$ . Moreover, the linear Poincaré map  $dP_t(\rho_t)$  is  $N$ -elementary. The eigenvalues of  $P_t$  have the form  $\exp(i\phi_j(t))$ , where  $0 < \phi_1(t) < \dots < \phi_{n-1}(t) < \pi$  and the map  $t \rightarrow \phi(t) := (\phi_1(t), \dots, \phi_{n-1}(t))$  is  $C^1$  in  $[0, \bar{\delta})$ . Moreover,  $P_t$  admits a Birkhoff normal form of order  $[N/2] \geq 2$  ( $[a]$  denotes the integer part of  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ ) in suitable polar symplectic coordinates which will be described below.

In order to avoid eventual singularities at  $r_j = 0$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, n-1$ , we fix  $0 < c_0 \ll 1$  and  $r_0 > 0$ , and set

$$\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{D}(c_0) := \{r = (r_1, \dots, r_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} : 0 < c_0|r| < |r_j| < r_0, 1 \leq j \leq n-1\}. \quad (4.24)$$

and  $\mathbb{A} := \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{D}$ . Denote by  $\text{pr} : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^{n-1}$  the canonical projection. We are going to use the following definition of a generating function of a symplectic map.

**Definition 4.1** *Let  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  be an open set and  $F \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times D)$ . The function  $S \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times D)$  given by  $S(x, r) = \langle x, r \rangle - F(\text{pr}(x), r)$  is said to be a generating function of a symplectic map  $P$  in  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times D$  if*

- *the map  $x \rightarrow \nabla_r S(x, r) = x - \nabla_r F(\text{pr}(x), r)$  projects to a diffeomorphism of  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1}$  homothope to the identity for any fixed  $r \in D$*
- *for any  $(\theta, r) \in \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times D$*

$$P(\theta - \nabla_r F(\theta, r), r) = (\theta, r - \nabla_\theta F(\theta, r))$$

Hereafter, we slightly abuse the notations identifying  $y = \nabla_r F(\theta, r) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  with its image  $\text{pr}(y) \in \mathbb{T}^{n-1}$ .

**Proposition 4.2** (*Birkhoff Normal Form*). *For any  $0 < \delta < \bar{\delta}$  there exists*

- *a  $C^1$ -family of exact symplectic transformation  $[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow (\tilde{\chi}_t : \mathbb{A} \rightarrow U_t := \chi_t(\mathbb{A}))$ , where  $U_t \subset \mathbf{B}_t^*\Gamma$  is an open set*

- a  $C^1$ -family of polynomials  $K_t \in \mathbb{R}_{[N/2]}[\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n-1}]$  with real coefficients of  $n-1$  variables  $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n-1}$  and of degree  $\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor$
- a  $C^1$ -family of real valued functions  $G_t \in C^\infty(\mathbb{A})$

such that the following holds

1. the function  $\tilde{G}_t \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{D})$  defined by  $\tilde{G}_t(x, r) := \langle x, r \rangle - K_t(r) - G_t(\text{pr}(x), r)$  is a generating function of the symplectic map  $\tilde{P}_t := \tilde{\chi}_t^{-1} \circ P_t \circ \tilde{\chi}_t$  in  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{D}$ ,
2. for any  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^{n-1}$  there exists  $C_{\alpha, \beta} > 0$  such that

$$|\partial_\theta^\alpha \partial_r^\beta G_t(\theta, r)| \leq C_{\alpha, \beta} |r|^{\frac{N+1}{2} - |\beta|}$$

for any  $t \in [0, \delta]$ ,  $(\theta, r) \in \mathbb{A}$ , and

3.  $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \tilde{\chi}_t(\theta, r) = \rho_t$ .

The first condition is satisfied for  $N \geq 2$  and  $|r| \leq r_0 \ll 1$  in view of the estimate in 2. and the inverse function theorem. Multiplying  $G_t$  by a smooth cut-off function of the form  $f_0(r) = f(r/r_0)$  where  $f$  is compactly supported in the unit ball and  $f(r) = 1$  for  $|r| \leq 1/2$  we obtain a smooth function with support contained in the ball of radius  $r_0$ . Notice that the estimates of 2 still hold for the function  $G_t f_0$  with constants  $C_{\alpha, \beta}$  depending on  $f$  but not on  $r_0$ .

The polynomial  $K_t$  is the so called Birkhoff polynomial,

$$\nabla K_t(0) = \phi(t)$$

and  $(r, \theta)$  are local polar symplectic coordinates. The construction of the Birkhoff normal form follows from that of Moser [44] (see also [31], Lemma 3.3.2).

The Birkhoff normal form of  $P_t$  is said to be *nondegenerate* if the Hessian of  $K_t$  at 0 does not vanish, i.e.  $\det \partial^2 K_t(0) \neq 0$ . We say as well that  $P_t$  is a *twisted map* at  $\rho_t$  in this case. Suppose now that  $P_0$  is twisted. Choosing  $\delta > 0$  sufficiently small we obtain by continuity that  $P_t$  is twisted for any  $t \in [0, \delta]$ , i.e.

$$\det \partial^2 K_t(0) \neq 0 \quad \forall t \in [0, \delta]. \quad (4.25)$$

Then  $\nabla K_t : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_t^* := \nabla K_t(\mathbb{D})$  is a diffeomorphism for any  $t \in [0, \delta]$  provided that  $r_0 \ll 1$ . Denote by  $Q_t : \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$  the corresponding non-degenerate completely integrable map defined by  $Q_t(\theta, r) := (\theta + \nabla K_t(r), r)$ . The set of frequency vectors of  $Q_t$  is  $\Omega_t := \mathbb{D}_t^*$ . This is an open cone-like set in  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  with vertex at  $\phi(t)$ .

We are going to prove a spectral rigidity result for analytic billiard tables of dimension two having the symmetries of the ellipse provided that one of the bouncing ball rays of the initial billiard table is elliptic and 4-elementary. Define a class of billiard tables as follows. Let  $(\tilde{X}, g)$ ,  $\dim \tilde{X} = 2$  be a Riemannian manifold of dimension two. Suppose that it admits two commuting involutions  $\mathcal{J}_k$ ,  $k = 1, 2$ , acting as isometries. Consider the family  $\mathcal{B}$  of billiard tables  $(X, g)$  in  $(\tilde{X}, g)$  such that the boundary  $\Gamma = \partial X$  of  $X$  is connected and invariant with respect to  $\mathcal{J}_k$ ,  $k = 1, 2$ . Then the set of fixed points of  $\mathcal{J}_k$ ,  $k = 1, 2$ , in  $X$  defines a bouncing ball geodesic  $\gamma_k$  of any  $(X, g) \in \mathcal{B}$ .

**Theorem 4.3** *Let  $(X, g) \in \mathcal{B}$ . Assume that the broken geodesic  $\gamma_1$  given by the set of fixed points of  $\mathcal{J}_1$  in  $X$  is elliptic, 4-elementary and that the corresponding Poincaré map is twisted. Suppose that  $(X_t, g) \in \mathcal{B}$ ,  $t \in [0, 1]$ , is a  $C^1$  deformation of  $(X, g)$  satisfying the weak isospectral condition  $(H_1) - (H_2)$ . Then  $\gamma_1$  is a bouncing ball geodesic of  $(X_t, g)$  for each  $t \in [0, 1]$  and  $\Gamma_t$  has a contact of infinite order to  $\Gamma_0$  at the vertices of  $\gamma_1$ . In particular,  $X_1 = X_0$  if the boundaries  $\Gamma_1 = \partial X_1$  and  $\Gamma_2 = \partial X_2$  are both analytic.*

The remaining of this Section is devoted to the spectral rigidity of the Kronecker tori in a vicinity of an elliptic geodesic. We address the following questions. Suppose that the  $C^1$  family of billiard tables  $(X, g_t)$ ,  $0 \leq t \leq 1$ , is weakly isospectral. Assume that  $(X, g_0)$  admits a periodic elliptic broken geodesic  $\gamma_0$  and that the corresponding local Poincaré map is twisted. Does there exist a  $C^1$  family of periodic elliptic broken geodesics  $[0, 1] \ni t \rightarrow \gamma_t$  in  $(X, g_t)$  along the whole perturbation? Do the corresponding local Poincaré map remain twisted? Do the invariant tori  $\Lambda_0(\omega)$  associated to  $\gamma_0$  give rise to  $C^1$  families of invariant tori  $[0, 1] \ni t \rightarrow \Lambda_t(\omega)$  along the whole perturbation? We give an answer of these questions in the following Theorem.

Denote by  $\mathbb{B}(\alpha, \epsilon) = \mathbb{B}^{n-1}(\alpha, \epsilon)$  the ball of radius  $\epsilon$  and center  $\alpha$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ . Recall that the functions  $\beta_t(\omega)$ ,  $I_t(\omega)$  and  $L_t(I)$  are defined by (1.5), (1.6) and (1.7) respectively.

**Theorem 4.4** *Let  $(X, g_t)$ ,  $t \in [0, 1]$ , be a  $C^1$  family of billiard tables of dimension  $n \geq 2$  satisfying the weak isospectral condition  $(H_1) - (H_2)$ . Suppose that  $(X, g_0)$  admits a closed elliptic broken billiard trajectory  $\gamma_0$  with  $m \geq 2$  vertices. Suppose as well that the corresponding linear Poincaré map  $dP(\rho_0)$  is  $N \geq 8$  elementary and that  $P = B^m$  is twisted at  $\rho_0$ . Then there exists  $\delta_0 > 0$  such that for any interval  $I = [0, \delta]$ ,  $0 < \delta < \delta_0$  the following holds.*

- (i) *There exist a  $C^1$ -family of elliptic fixed points  $I \ni t \rightarrow \rho_t \in \mathbf{B}_t^* \Gamma$  of  $P_t = B_t^m$ , the corresponding linear Poincaré map  $dP_t(\rho_t)$  is  $N$ -elementary and  $P_t$  is twisted at  $\rho_t$ . Moreover for any  $t \in I$  and  $|\alpha| \leq \frac{N}{4} - 1$*

$$\partial^\alpha \nabla K_t(0) = \partial^\alpha \nabla K_0(0). \quad (4.26)$$

- (ii) *There is a set  $\Xi$  of positive Lebesgue measure consisting of Diophantine frequencies such that*

$$\lim_{\epsilon \searrow 0} \frac{\text{meas}(\Xi \cap \mathbb{B}(\phi(0), \epsilon))}{\text{meas}(\mathbb{B}(\phi(0), \epsilon))} = 0$$

*and for any  $\omega \in \Xi$  there is a  $C^1$  family of Kronecker invariant tori  $I \ni t \rightarrow \Lambda_t(\omega) \subset \mathbf{B}_t^* \Gamma$  of  $P_t$  of a frequency  $\omega$ .*

- (iii)  *$\beta_t(\omega) = \beta_0(\omega)$ ,  $L_t(I_0(\omega)) = L_0(I_0(\omega))$ , and  $I_t(\omega) = I_0(\omega)$  for any  $t \in I$  and  $\omega \in \Xi$ .*

It follows from (4.26) that the function  $[0, \delta_0] \ni t \rightarrow \phi(t) = \nabla K_t(0)$  is constant, i.e.

$$\forall t \in [0, \delta_0], \quad \text{Spec}(dP_t(\rho_t)) = \text{Spec}(dP_0(\rho_0)). \quad (4.27)$$

A natural question is to describe the largest interval  $I$ , if it exists, for which Theorem 4.4 holds. The answer is given by

**Proposition 4.5** *Let  $N \geq 12$ . Then there are only two possibilities that may occur.*

- (i) *the conclusion (i) – (iii) of Theorem 4.4 holds with  $I = [0, 1]$*

(ii) there is  $0 < \delta_0 \leq 1$  such that Theorem 4.4 holds in any interval  $I = [0, \delta]$  with  $0 < \delta < \delta_0$  and the limit set

$$\Sigma_{\delta_0} := \lim_{t \rightarrow \delta_0} \{\rho_t, B(\rho_t), \dots, B^{m-1}(\rho_t)\}$$

intersects the boundary of  $B_{\delta_0}^* \Gamma$ .

The case (ii) means that there is a generalized (glancing to the boundary at certain point) geodesic issuing from the limit set  $\Sigma_{\delta_0}$ . If the billiard tables  $(X, g_t)$ ,  $t \in [0, 1]$ , are locally strictly geodesically convex then each generalized geodesics of  $(X, g_t)$  lies entirely on  $\Gamma$  and the second case can not occur.

We are going to prove Theorem 4.3, Theorem 4.4 and Proposition 4.5. Firstly using Theorem 9.10 we will obtain a KAM theorem for the  $C^1$  family of symplectic maps  $\tilde{P}_t$  given by Proposition 4.2. To this end we will determine the convex set  $\Omega$ , fix the parameters  $\kappa$  and  $\varrho$ , and then estimate the corresponding quantities  $\mathcal{B}_\ell$  which appear in Theorem 9.10.

Consider the  $C^1$  family of exact symplectic mappings  $\tilde{P}_t$  in  $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{D}$  with generating functions

$$\tilde{G}_t(x, r) := \langle x, r \rangle - K_t(r) - G_t(\text{pr}(x), r), \quad (x, r) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{D}, \quad (4.28)$$

given by Proposition 4.2. Recall that  $t \rightarrow K_t$  is a  $C^1$ -family of polynomials with real coefficients of  $n-1$  variables and of degree  $\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor$ , i.e.  $K_t \in \mathbb{R}_{[N/2]}(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n-1})$ , while  $t \rightarrow G_t \in C^\infty(\mathbb{A})$  is a  $C^1$ -family of real valued functions with support in  $\mathbb{B}(0, r_0)$  such that

$$|\partial_\theta^\alpha \partial_r^\beta G_t(\theta, r)| \leq C_{\alpha, \beta} |r|^{\frac{N+1}{2} - |\beta|} \quad (4.29)$$

for any  $t \in [0, \delta]$ ,  $(\theta, r) \in \mathbb{A}$ , and  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^{n-1}$ .

There exists a constant  $A \geq 1$  such that

$$\forall t, s \in [0, \delta], \quad \|K_t - K_s\|_{C^{[N/2]}} \leq A|t - s|, \quad (4.30)$$

where the norm is taken in  $C^{[N/2]}(\mathbb{B}(0, 1))$ . The map  $P_0$  is twisted, then by continuity  $P_t$  remains twisted for any  $t \in [0, \delta]$  provided that  $\delta > 0$  is sufficiently small. Choosing  $\delta > 0$  small enough, there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that the Legendre transform  $K_t^*$  of  $K_t$  given by (9.144) is well defined in  $\mathbb{B}(\phi(0), \varepsilon)$  and

$$\nabla K_t^* : \mathbb{B}(\phi(0), \varepsilon) \rightarrow V_t := \nabla K_t^*(\mathbb{B}(\phi(0), \varepsilon))$$

is a  $C^1$  family of diffeomorphisms with respect to  $t \in [0, \delta]$ , where  $V_t$  is a neighborhood of 0. Moreover, the corresponding inverse maps are  $\nabla K_t : V_t \rightarrow \mathbb{B}(\phi(0), \varepsilon)$ , hence,  $\nabla K_t \circ \nabla K_t^* = \text{id}$  on  $\mathbb{B}(\phi(0), \varepsilon)$  for any  $t \in [0, \delta]$ . In particular the inverse map of  $d\nabla K_t(0) : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  is  $d\nabla K_t^*(\phi(t))$ .

We are ready to define suitable convex sets of frequencies  $\Omega$ . Choose  $e = (e_1, \dots, e_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  such that

$$2c_0 < |e_j| < \frac{1}{2n}, \quad j = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad (4.31)$$

where  $0 < c_0 < 1/4n$  is fixed in (4.24) and set  $e^* := d\nabla K_t(0)e$ . Given  $0 < a_0 < \varepsilon$  and  $0 < \eta_0 < 1$  we consider for any  $0 < a \leq a_0$  the cube of center  $\phi(t) + ae^*$  with sides of length  $2\eta_0 a$  defined by

$$\Omega = \Omega(t, a) := \left\{ \omega \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} : |\omega_j - \phi_j(t) - ae_j^*| < \eta_0 a, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n-1 \right\},$$

Obviously,  $\overline{\Omega}(t, a) \subset \mathbb{B}(\phi(0), \varepsilon)$  for  $a_0 \ll \varepsilon$ , hence,  $\nabla K_t^*$  is well defined and smooth on the convex set  $\overline{\Omega}(t, a)$ . Denote by  $I_{t,a}$  the set of all  $s \in [0, \delta]$  such that  $|t - s| \leq \eta_0 a$ . Denote by  $\mathbb{D}_a$  the connected component of the set

$$\left\{ r = (r_1, \dots, r_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} : c_0 < |r_j| < a/n, 1 \leq j \leq n-1 \right\}$$

containing  $ae$ . Then  $\mathbb{D}_a$  is a *convex* open set and  $ae \in \mathbb{D}_a$ . We claim that there exist  $0 < a_0 < 1$  and  $0 < \eta_0 < 1$  such that for any  $0 < a \leq a_0$ ,  $t \in [0, \delta]$  and  $s \in I_{t,a}$  the following relation holds

$$\mathbb{D}^s(t, a) := \nabla K_s^*(\Omega(t, a)) \subset \mathbb{D}_a \subset \mathbb{D}, \quad (4.32)$$

where  $\mathbb{D}$  is defined by (4.24). Indeed, for any  $\omega \in \Omega(t, a)$ , using Taylor's formula up to order three for the function  $\omega \rightarrow \nabla K_t^*(\omega)$  at  $\omega = \phi(t)$  and the identity  $\nabla K_t^*(\phi(t)) = \nabla K_t^*(\nabla K_t(0)) = 0$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla K_s^*(\omega) - ae| &\leq A\eta_0 a + |\nabla K_t^*(\omega) - a(d\nabla K_t^*)(\phi(t))e^*| \\ &\leq aC_n((A+B)\eta_0 + Ba) \end{aligned}$$

where  $C_n$  depends only on  $n$ ,  $A > 0$  is the constant in (4.30) and

$$B := 1 + \sup_{0 \leq t \leq \delta} \|\nabla K_t^*\|_{C^2(\mathbb{B}(\phi(t), \varepsilon))}.$$

Then the inclusion  $\mathbb{D}^s(t, a) \subset \mathbb{D}_a$  follows from (4.31) choosing  $\eta_0$  and  $a_0$  so that

$$C_n((A+B)\eta_0 + Ba_0) < c_0 < 1/2n.$$

On the other hand, the inequalities  $c_0 a < |r_j| < a/n$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, n-1$ , imply  $c_0 |r| < c_0 a < |r_j|$  and we obtain the second inclusion in (4.32), which proves the claim.

Set  $\mathbb{A}^s(t, a) := \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{D}^s(t, a)$  for  $s \in I_{t,a}$ . The relation (4.32) allows one to apply Proposition 4.2 in  $\mathbb{D}^s(t, a)$  for any  $t \in [0, \delta]$  fixed, where the parameter of the deformation  $s$  varies in  $I_{t,a}$ . We point out that both  $\Omega(t, a)$  and  $\mathbb{D}_a$  are *convex* open sets which allows us to apply Theorem 9.10 and to obtain the corresponding Hölder estimates.

Fix  $\tau > n-1$  and choose  $\kappa = \eta a$  in the Diophantine condition (1.2), where  $0 < \eta < \eta_0$ . Denote by  $\Omega_{t,\kappa}$  the set of all  $\omega \in \Omega(t, a) \cap D(\tau, \kappa)$  such that  $\text{dist}(\omega, \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \setminus \Omega) \geq \kappa$ . There exists  $0 < \eta_1 = c(n, \tau)\eta_0$ , where  $0 < c(n, \tau) < 1$  depends only on  $n$  and  $\tau$  such that the Lebesgue measure of  $\Omega_{t,\kappa}$  is positive for any  $t \in [0, \delta]$ ,  $0 < \eta < \eta_1$  and  $a \in (0, a_0]$ . Indeed, it follows from [37], Proposition 9.9 that

$$\text{meas}(\Omega(t, a) \setminus \Omega_{t,\eta a}) \leq C \frac{\eta}{\eta_0} \text{meas}(\Omega(t, a)), \quad (4.33)$$

where the positive constant  $C$  depends only on  $n$  and  $\tau$ , and we take  $c = 1/C$ . Let us fix  $0 < \eta < \eta_1$  and denote by  $\Omega_{t,\kappa}^0$  the set of points of positive Lebesgue density in  $\Omega_{t,\kappa}$  (see Sect. 9.4).

**Theorem 4.6** *Let  $[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow \tilde{P}_t$  be a  $C^1$  family of symplectic mappings with generating functions  $\tilde{G}_t$  given by (4.28), where  $K_t \in \mathbb{R}_{[N/2]}[\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n-1}]$  while  $G_t \in C^\infty(\mathbb{A})$  satisfies (4.29) with  $N \geq 4$ . Then for any  $t \in [0, \delta]$  there exists a  $C^1$ -family of exact symplectic maps*

$$I_{t,a} \ni s \rightarrow (\chi_s : \mathbb{A}^s(t, a) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^s(t, a))$$

*and of real valued functions  $L_s \in C^\infty(\mathbb{D}^s(t, a))$  and  $R_t \in C^\infty(\mathbb{A}^s(t, a))$  such that for any  $s \in I_{t,a}$  the following holds*

1.  $\tilde{G}_s^0(x, I) = \langle x, I \rangle - L_s(I) - R_s(\text{pr}(x), I)$  is a generating function of  $P_s^0 := \chi_s^{-1} \circ \tilde{P}_s \circ \chi_s$
2.  $\nabla L_s : \mathbb{D}^s(t, a) \rightarrow \Omega(t, a)$  is a diffeomorphism
3.  $R_s$  is flat at  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \nabla L_s^*(\Omega_{t,\kappa}^0)$
4. for any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists a constant  $C_m > 0$  independent of  $a \in (0, a_0]$  and  $t \in [0, \delta]$  such that the following estimates hold

$$|\partial_\varphi^\alpha (a\partial_\omega)^\beta \sigma_a^{-1}(\chi_s - \text{id})| + |\partial_\varphi^\alpha (a\partial_\omega)^\beta \sigma_a^{-1}(\chi_s^{-1} - \text{id})| \leq C_m a^{\frac{N-3}{4}}$$

on  $\mathbb{A}^s(t, a)$ , and

$$|(a\partial_I)^\beta (\nabla L_s(I) - \nabla K_s(I))| \leq C_m a^{\frac{N+1}{4}} \quad (4.34)$$

on  $\mathbb{D}^s(t, a)$  for any  $s \in I_{t,a}$  and  $|\alpha| + |\beta| \leq m$ .

Moreover, if  $\nabla K_t(0) = \nabla K_0(0)$  for any  $t \in [0, \delta]$ , then for any  $0 < a \leq a_0$  there exists a  $C^1$ -family of exact symplectic maps  $\chi_s : \mathbb{A}^0(0, a) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^0(0, a)$  in  $I = [0, \delta]$  and of real valued functions  $L_s \in C^\infty(\mathbb{D}^0(0, a))$  and  $R_t \in C^\infty(\mathbb{A}^0(0, a))$  such that 1.) - 4.) hold for any  $s \in I$  and  $t = 0$ .

*Proof.* To prove the first part of the Theorem we apply Theorem 9.10 to the  $C^1$  family of symplectic mappings  $I_{t,a} \ni s \rightarrow \tilde{P}_s \in C^\infty(\mathbb{A}^s(t, a), \mathbb{A}^s(t, a))$ .

Let us estimate the corresponding quantities  $\mathcal{B}_\ell$  for  $\ell \geq 1$  defined by (9.176)-(9.178). First of all the constant  $\lambda$  in (9.184) can be fixed by

$$\lambda = \sup_{t \in [0, \delta]} \|\partial^2 K_t\|_{C^{[N/2]}(\mathbb{B}(0,1))}.$$

Given  $\ell = m + \mu$  with  $m \in \mathbb{N}_*$  and  $0 \leq \mu < 1$  we get by (4.32) that for any  $s \in I_{t,a}$

$$\|G_s\|_{\ell, \mathbb{A}^s(t, a); \kappa} \leq \|G_s\|_{\ell, \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{D}_a; \kappa} \leq \|G_s\|_{m+1, \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{D}_a; \kappa}.$$

The second inequality follows from the fact that  $\mathbb{D}_a$  is convex. On the other hand,

$$\|G_s\|_{m+1, \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{D}_a; \kappa} = \sup_{|\alpha| + |\beta| \leq m+1} \|\partial_\theta^\alpha (\kappa \partial_r)^\beta G_t\|_{C^0(\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{D}_a)}$$

and using Proposition 4.2, 2, we obtain  $\|G_s\|_{\ell, \mathbb{A}^s(t, a); \kappa} \leq C_m a^{\frac{N+1}{2}}$  for any  $s \in I_{t,a}$ . We choose  $\varrho = \kappa^{\frac{N+1}{4}} < \kappa$ , where  $N \geq 4$ . Then

$$\|G_s\|_{\ell, \mathbb{A}^s(t, a); \kappa} \leq \kappa \varrho C'_m a^{\frac{N-3}{4}}$$

for any  $s \in I_{t,a}$ , where  $C'_m = C_m \eta^{-\frac{N+5}{4}}$ . Moreover,

$$\|\partial^2 K_s\|_{\ell, \mathbb{A}^s(t, a); \kappa} \leq \|\partial^2 K_s\|_{\ell, \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{B}(0,1); \kappa} \leq C \|\partial^2 K_t\|_{C^{[N/2]}(\mathbb{B}(0,1))}$$

and

$$S_\ell(\nabla K^*) \leq \sup_{0 \leq t \leq \delta} (1 + \|\nabla K_t^*\|_{C^1(\mathbb{B}(\phi(0), \varepsilon))})^{\ell-1} (1 + \|\nabla K_t^*\|_{C^\ell(\mathbb{B}(\phi(0), \varepsilon))}).$$

Thus for any  $\ell \geq 1$  we obtain

$$\mathcal{B}_\ell \leq \kappa \varrho C_\ell a^{\frac{N-3}{4}}$$

where  $C_\ell > 0$  depends neither on  $a \in (0, a_0]$  nor on  $t \in [0, \delta]$ . Choosing  $a_0 \ll 1$  we get  $\mathcal{B}_2 \leq \epsilon \kappa \varrho \lambda^{-4}$ , which gives (9.185). Applying Theorem 9.10 we obtain 1-4.

The equality  $\nabla K_t(0) = \nabla K_0(0)$  means that  $\phi(t) = \phi(0)$  which implies  $\Omega(t, a) = \Omega(0, a)$ . Then one can take  $I_{t,a} = [0, \delta]$  in (4.32) which implies 1-4 in  $[0, \delta]$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 4.3.* The set of fixed points of  $\mathcal{J}_1$  in  $X_t \in \mathcal{B}$  defines a bouncing ball geodesic  $\gamma_t$  in  $(X_t, g)$  which is preserved by  $\mathcal{J}_2$ . We are going to apply Theorem 4.6 to the Birkhoff Normal Forms of the local Poincaré maps  $P_t$  associated to  $\gamma_t$ .

Let  $t \rightarrow \rho_t$  be a  $C^1$  family of fixed points of  $P_t = B_t^2$ . Denote by  $\rho_{t,j} = (x_{t,j}, 0) = B_t^j(\rho_t)$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ , the corresponding periodic orbit of  $B_t$ . Fix  $t \in [0, \delta]$ . Denote by  $U \subset \tilde{X}$  a neighborhood of the vertices  $x_{t,0}$  and  $x_{t,1}$  of  $\gamma_{t,1}$  such that  $\mathcal{J}_k(U) = U$ ,  $k = 1, 2$ . Denote the restrictions of the two involutions to  $\Gamma_t \cap U$  by  $J_1$  and  $J_2$  and by  $\tilde{J}_j : T^*(\Gamma_t \cap U) \rightarrow T^*(\Gamma_t \cap U)$  the corresponding lifts. The set  $\Gamma_t \cap U$  has two connected components  $\Gamma_t^j$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ , and  $J_1(\Gamma_t^1) = \Gamma_t^1$  while  $J_2(\Gamma_t^1) = \Gamma_t^2$ . Since  $J_1$  and  $J_2$  act as isometries and commute with each other, using the definition of  $B_t$  in Sect. 2.1, we obtain that the involutions  $\tilde{J}_j$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ , commute with each other and also with  $B_t$ .

Denote by  $\Xi$  the union of  $\Omega_{t,\eta a}$ ,  $0 < a \leq a_0$ . For any  $\omega \in \Xi$  we set  $\Lambda_t^1(\omega) = \Lambda_t(\omega)$  and  $\Lambda_t^2(\omega) = B_t(\Lambda_t(\omega))$ . Then  $\tilde{J}_1(\Lambda_t^j(\omega))$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ , are also invariant circles of  $P_t = B_t^2$  of frequency  $\omega \in \Xi$  and  $\Lambda_t^j(\omega) = \tilde{J}_1(\Lambda_t^j(\omega))$  for  $j = 1, 2$ , while  $\Lambda_\omega^2 = \tilde{J}_2(\Lambda_t^1(\omega))$ . To prove it we use the following argument. Since  $\dim T^*\Gamma_{t,j} = 2$  the KAM circle  $\Lambda_t^j(\omega)$  divides  $T^*\Gamma_{t,j}$  into two connected components, and it contains the elliptic fixed point  $\rho_{t,j} = (x_{t,j}, 0)$  of  $P_t$  in its interior  $D_j$ . Moreover,  $\tilde{J}_1(\rho_j) = \rho_j$ , hence,  $\tilde{J}_1(\Lambda_t^j(\omega))$  contains  $\rho_{t,j}$  in its interior  $\tilde{J}_1(D_j)$  as well. On the other hand,  $\tilde{J}_1$  preserves the volume form of  $T^*\Gamma_{t,1}$ , hence,  $\Lambda_t^j(\omega)$  intersects  $\tilde{J}_1(\Lambda_t^j(\omega))$ . This implies  $\Lambda_t^1(\omega) = \tilde{J}_1(\Lambda_t^1(\omega))$ , since  $P_t$  acts transitively on both of them. In the same way we prove that  $\Lambda_t^2(\omega) = \tilde{J}_2(\Lambda_t^1(\omega))$ .

Recall that the family  $\Gamma_t$ ,  $t \in [0, 1]$ , is given by a  $C^1$  family of embeddings  $\psi_t \in C^\infty(\Gamma, \tilde{X})$ , where  $\psi_t(\Gamma) = \Gamma_t$ . Without loss of generality we suppose that  $\gamma_0 = \text{id}_\Gamma$  is the identity at  $\Gamma$ . Notice that the vectors  $\frac{\partial \psi_t}{\partial x}(x)$  and  $\nu_t(\psi_t(x))$  provide a base of  $T_{\psi_t(x)}\tilde{X}$  for any  $x \in \Gamma$ , hence,

$$\forall x \in \Gamma_t, \quad \dot{\psi}_t(x) = \lambda(t, x) \frac{\partial \psi_t}{\partial x}(x) + \delta_\nu \Gamma_t(\psi_t(x)) \nu_t(\psi_t(x)) \quad (4.35)$$

where  $t \rightarrow \lambda(t, \cdot) \in C^\infty(\Gamma)$  is continuous on  $[0, \delta]$  and the function  $\delta_\nu \Gamma_t$  is defined by (2.15) and it belongs to  $C^\infty(\Gamma_t)$ . We are going to show that the function  $\delta_\nu \Gamma_t$  is flat at  $x_{t,1}$ .

Using Corollary 3 and the symmetry with respect to  $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_1$  given above we obtain

$$\int_{\Lambda_t(\omega)} \langle \xi_t^+(\rho), \nu_t(\pi_t(\rho)) \rangle \delta_\nu \Gamma_t(\pi_t(\rho)) d\mu_t(\rho) = 0 \quad (4.36)$$

for any  $\omega \in \Xi$ , with  $0 < a \leq a_0$ . Moreover, the functions

$$\rho \rightarrow f_t(\rho) := \langle \xi_t^+(\rho), \nu_t(\pi_t(\rho)) \rangle, \quad \rho \rightarrow h_t(\rho) := \delta_\nu \Gamma_t(\pi_t(\rho))$$

are invariant with respect to the involution  $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_1$ . Let us parametrize  $\Gamma_t^1$  by its arclength  $y \in [-c, c]$  so that  $y(x_{t,1}) = 0$  and denote by  $(y, \eta)$  the corresponding local coordinates in  $T^*\Gamma_{t,1}$ . Then  $J_1(y) = -y$  for any  $y$ . For any invariant circle  $\Lambda_t^1(\omega)$ ,  $\omega \in \Xi$ , there is  $y(\omega) > 0$  such that

$\pi_t(\Lambda_t^1(\omega)) = [-y(\omega), y(\omega)]$ . Notice that  $f_t(y, \eta) = \langle \xi_t^+(y, \eta), \nu_t(y) \rangle > 0$  for  $(y, \eta) \in \Lambda_t^1(\omega)$  since  $\Lambda_t^1(\omega)$  is contained in  $\mathbf{B}_t^*(\Gamma_t)$ . On the other hand,  $h_t(y, \eta) = h_t(y)$  depends only on  $y$ . We are going to show that there exists an infinite sequence  $(y_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset (0, c)$  such that  $\lim y_j = 0$  and  $h_t(y_j) = 0$ . Indeed, suppose that  $h_t(y) \neq 0$  in  $(0, b)$  for some  $b > 0$ . Take  $\omega \in \Xi$  such that  $0 < y(\omega) < b$ . The function  $h_t(y)$  is *even* because it is invariant with respect to  $\mathcal{J}_1$ , hence it will not change its sign in the interval  $[-y(\omega), y(\omega)]$ . Then  $h_t(y, \eta)f_t(y)$  will not change its sign on  $\Lambda_t^1(\omega)$  and it is not identically null, which contradicts (4.36). This proves the existence of an infinite sequence  $\{y_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that  $h_t(y_j) = 0$ ,  $y_j \neq 0$  for any  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\lim y_j = 0$ . Now there exists an infinite sequence  $(y'_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset (0, b)$  such that  $y_j \leq y'_j \leq y_{j+1}$  and  $\frac{dh_t}{dy}(y'_j) = 0$ , and so on. This implies that the Taylor series of  $h_t(y)$  vanishes at  $y = 0$ . In particular we obtain that  $x_{t,j} = x_{0,j}$  since  $\lambda(t, x_{t,j}) = 0$ . Hence, the function  $\Gamma_t \ni x \rightarrow \delta_\nu \Gamma_t(x)$  is flat at  $x = x_{0,1}$ .

Take local coordinates  $x : \Gamma_0^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  in the neighborhood  $\Gamma_0^1$  of  $x_{0,1}$  in  $\Gamma = \Gamma_0$  such that  $x(x_{0,1}) = 0$  and consider the equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}u_t(x) = -\lambda(t, u_t(x)) \quad (4.37)$$

with initial data  $u_0(x) = x$ . This problem has a unique solution  $u_t(x)$  for  $t$  in a neighborhood of 0 and  $x$  in an open interval  $V \subset \mathbb{R}$  containing  $x = 0$ . Moreover,  $u_t : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a  $C^1$  family of local diffeomorphisms. Consider the  $C^1$  family of embeddings  $v_t = \psi_t \circ u_t : V \rightarrow \tilde{X}$ . The set  $v_t(V)$  is an open neighborhood of  $x_{0,1}$  in  $\Gamma_t$ ,  $v_t$  gives a local parametrization of  $\Gamma_t$  in  $v_t(V)$  and  $v_0(x) = x$ . Using (4.35) and (4.37) one obtains that the map

$$V \ni x \rightarrow \dot{v}_t(x) = \delta_\nu \Gamma_t(v_t(x))\nu_t(v_t(x))$$

is flat at  $x = 0$  for any  $s \in [0, \delta]$ . Then for any  $\varphi \in C^\infty(\tilde{X})$ , the function

$$V \ni x \rightarrow \varphi(v_t(x)) - \varphi(x) = \int_0^t d\varphi(v_s(x))\dot{v}_s(x)ds$$

is flat at  $x = 0$  which means that  $\Gamma_t$  is tangent to infinite order to  $\Gamma_0$  at  $x_{0,1}$  for  $t > 0$  sufficiently small. Replacing  $\Gamma$  by  $\Gamma_t$ ,  $t \in [0, 1]$ , we complete the proof of the Theorem.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 4.4.* It follows from Theorem 4.6 that for any  $0 < a \leq a_0 \ll 1$  and  $\omega \in \Omega_{t,\kappa}$  with  $\kappa = \eta a$  there is a  $C^1$  family of Kronecker invariant tori  $I_{t,a} \ni s \rightarrow \Lambda_s(\omega)$  of  $P_s$ . Moreover, Corollary 2 implies that  $I_s(\omega) = I_t(\omega)$  and  $\nabla L_s(I_t(\omega)) = \nabla L_t(I_t(\omega))$ , hence,  $\partial_I^\alpha \nabla L_s(I_t(\omega)) = \partial_I^\alpha \nabla L_t(I_t(\omega))$  for any  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{n-1}$  in view of Lemma 6.3. Then for any  $\omega \in \Omega_{t,\kappa}$ ,  $s \in I_{t,a}$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{n-1}$  of length  $|\alpha| \leq N/4 - 1$  using (4.34) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_I^\alpha \nabla K_s(I_t(\omega)) - \partial_I^\alpha \nabla K_t(I_t(\omega))| &\leq |\partial_I^\alpha \nabla K_s(I_t(\omega)) - \partial_I^\alpha \nabla L_s(I_t(\omega))| \\ &\quad + |\partial_I^\alpha \nabla K_t(I_t(\omega)) - \partial_I^\alpha \nabla L_t(I_t(\omega))| \\ &\leq C a^{\frac{N+1}{4}-|\alpha|} \leq C a^{\frac{5}{4}}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking  $s = t + a$  there is  $t(a) \in [t, t + a]$  such that

$$\left| \frac{d}{ds} \Big|_{s=t(a)} \partial_I^\alpha \nabla K_s(I_t(\omega)) \right| \leq C a^{\frac{1}{4}},$$

where the positive constant  $C$  is independent of  $a \in (0, a_0)$  and  $\omega \in \Omega_{t,\kappa}^0$ . Let  $a \rightarrow 0$ . Then  $\Omega_{t,\kappa}^0 \subset \Omega(t, a)$  shrinks to  $\phi(t)$ , hence,

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \sup\{|I_t(\omega)| : \omega \in \Omega_{t,\kappa}^0\} = 0$$

and we get

$$\frac{d}{dt} \partial^\alpha \nabla K_t(0) = 0$$

for any  $t \in [0, \delta]$ . This implies (4.26) in that interval. By assumption  $N \geq 8$ , hence (4.27) holds for  $t \in [0, \delta]$ .

We are going to define the set of frequencies  $\Xi$  as a union of  $\Omega_{0,\kappa}^0$ . Recall that  $\kappa = \eta a$ , where  $0 < \eta \leq \eta_1 = c(n, \tau)\eta_0$ . Moreover,  $\Omega(0, a)$  depends on the choice of  $e^* := d\nabla K_t(0)e$ , where  $d\nabla K_t(0)$  is an isomorphism of  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  and  $e$  satisfies (4.31), hence,  $\Omega(0, a)$  depends as well as on the parameter  $0 < c_0 < 1/4n$  defined in (4.24). Now varying the parameters  $0 < c_0 < 1/2n$ ,  $e$  satisfying (4.31),  $0 < a \leq a_0$  and  $0 < \eta \leq \eta_1 = c(n, \tau)\eta_0$  we denote by  $\Xi$  the union of the corresponding sets  $\Omega_{0,\kappa}^0$ . The set of frequencies  $\Xi$  satisfies (ii) by construction in view of (4.33). Using the second part of Theorem 4.6 and Corollary 2 in  $I = [0, \delta]$  we complete the proof of the Theorem.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 4.5.* Denote by  $0 < \delta_0 \leq 1$  the supremum of all  $\delta > 0$  such that (i), Theorem 4.4 holds in  $[0, \delta]$ . Suppose that  $\delta_0 < 1$  and that  $\Sigma_{\delta_0} \subset \mathbf{B}_{\delta_0}^* \Gamma$ . Fix  $\rho$  in the limit set  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \delta_0} \rho_t$ . Then  $P_{\delta_0} = B_{\delta_0}^m$  is well-defined and smooth in a neighborhood of  $\rho$ . By continuity,  $\rho$  is a fixed point of  $P_{\delta_0}$  and (4.27) holds true for  $t \in [0, \delta_0]$ . Hence,  $\rho$  is an elliptic fixed point of  $P_{\delta_0}$  and there are no resonances of order less or equal to  $N$ . Now Proposition 4.2 provides a  $C^1$  family of Birkhoff normal forms of  $P_t$  in an interval  $t \in [0, \delta_0 + \varepsilon]$ , where  $\varepsilon > 0$ . On the other hand, (4.26) implies that  $\partial^2 K_t(0) = \partial^2 K_0(0)$  for  $t \in [0, \delta_0[$  since  $N \geq 12$ . By continuity, this equality is true for  $t \in [0, \delta_0]$ . Then  $P_t$  is twisted for any  $t \in [0, \delta_0 + \varepsilon]$ , provided that  $\varepsilon > 0$  is sufficiently small. Applying Theorem 4.6 we show as above that (i) and (ii) in Theorem 4.4 hold in  $[0, \delta_0 + \varepsilon]$ . This contradicts the choice of  $\delta_0$ . If  $\delta_0 = 1$  and  $\Sigma_1 \subset \mathbf{B}_{\delta_0}^* \Gamma$ , then (i) holds in  $[0, 1]$  and Theorem 4.6 holds in  $I = [0, 1]$ .  $\square$

## 5 Isospectral deformation of locally strictly geodesically convex billiard tables of dimension two.

The aim of this Section is to prove Theorem 4. More generally we consider isospectral deformations of a billiard table  $(X, g)$  in an ambient Riemannian manifold  $(\tilde{X}, g)$  with a locally strictly geodesically convex (with respect to the outward normal) boundary  $\Gamma = \partial X$ . This means that if a geodesic  $s \rightarrow \gamma(s)$  of  $(\tilde{X}, g)$  is tangent to  $\Gamma$  at  $s = 0$  then the order of the tangency is exactly two and  $\gamma(s) \notin X$  for  $0 < |s| \ll 1$ . The behavior of the billiard ball map near  $S^*\Gamma$  is investigated by Melrose [41] and Marvizi and Melrose [39] in the more general context of pairs of glancing surfaces.

Consider the hypersurfaces  $\Sigma_1 := S^*\tilde{X}$  and  $\Sigma_2 := T^*\tilde{X}|_\Gamma$  in  $T^*\tilde{X}$ . Set  $f_1 = h - 1$ , where the Hamiltonian  $h$  is just the Legendre transform  $h(x, \xi) = g^{ij}(x)\xi_i\xi_j$  of the Riemannian metric

defined locally by  $g(x, v) = g_{ij}(x)v^i v^j$  and denote by  $f_2 \in C^\infty(T^*\tilde{X})$  a smooth function which is constant on the fibers ( $f_2(x, \xi) = f_2(x)$ ) and such that  $f_2(x) > 0$  for  $x$  in the interior of  $X$ ,  $f_2(x) < 0$  in the exterior of  $X$  and  $f_2(x) = 0$ ,  $df_2(x) \neq 0$  for  $x \in \Gamma$ . Then the hypersurfaces  $\Sigma_j$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ , are just the zero level sets of the non-degenerate Hamiltonians  $f_j$  ( $df_j \neq 0$  on  $\Sigma_j = \{f_j = 0\}$ ). One can show that  $\Gamma$  is locally strictly geodesically convex with respect to the outward normal to  $\Gamma$  if and only if the following relation holds

$$f_1(\varrho) = f_2(\varrho) = \{f_1, f_2\}(\varrho) = 0 \implies \{f_1, \{f_1, f_2\}\}(\varrho) < 0 \text{ and } \{f_2, \{f_2, f_1\}\}(\varrho) > 0, \quad (5.38)$$

where  $\{, \}$  is the Poisson bracket related to the canonical symplectic two-form  $\tilde{\omega}$  of  $T^*\tilde{X}$ . In particular

$$\mathcal{K} := \{\varrho \in T^*\tilde{X} : f_1(\varrho) = f_2(\varrho) = \{f_1, f_2\}(\varrho) = 0\}$$

is a smooth submanifold of  $T^*\tilde{X}$  of co-dimension two. The characteristic foliations of the two-form  $\tilde{\omega}|_{\Sigma_j}$  given by the non-parametrized integral curves of the hamiltonian vector fields of  $f_j$  define two involutions  $\mathcal{J}_j$  in a neighborhood  $U$  of the glancing manifold  $\mathcal{K}$  in  $\Sigma := \Sigma_1 \cap \Sigma_2$ . For any  $\varrho \in U \setminus \mathcal{K}$ , the point  $\mathcal{J}_j(\varrho) \in U$  is just the second point of intersection of the characteristic of  $\tilde{\omega}|_{\Sigma_j}$  passing through  $\varrho$  with  $U$ . The set of fixed points of  $\mathcal{J}_j$  is just  $\mathcal{K}$ . Moreover, (5.38) implies that the differentials of  $\mathcal{J}_j$  are linearly independent at any point of  $\mathcal{K}$ . The billiard ball map is given by the composition  $\mathcal{J} := \mathcal{J}_2 \circ \mathcal{J}_1 : U \rightarrow U$ . Moreover,  $\mathcal{J}_j^* \omega_\Sigma = \omega_\Sigma$ , where  $\omega_\Sigma := \tilde{\omega}|_\Sigma$ . Then the billiard ball map  $\mathcal{J}$  preserves  $\omega|_\Sigma$  as well. Notice that the map  $\mathcal{J}$  is smooth in  $U$  but the two-form  $\omega|_\Sigma$  is degenerate at  $\mathcal{K}$ . To make the later symplectic one considers the quotient space  $U/\mathcal{J}_2$  of  $U$  by the action of  $\mathcal{J}_2$ . In our case it is given by the closed co-ball bundle  $\overline{B}^* \Gamma \subset T^* \Gamma$  equipped with the canonical symplectic two-form. Let  $\pi : U \rightarrow U/\mathcal{J}_2 \cong \overline{B}^* \Gamma$  be the canonical projection. Then the billiard ball map is represented by the boundary map  $B = \pi \circ \mathcal{J}_1 \circ \pi^+$ , where  $\pi^+$  is defined by (2.13). We call  $B$  a billiard ball map as well.

A local normal form of the pair of involutions  $\mathcal{J}_j$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ , and of the two form  $\omega$  has been obtained by Melrose [41] in a neighborhood of any point of the glancing manifold  $\mathcal{K}$ . This normal form leads to a local symplectic normal form of the billiard ball map  $B$  at any point of the projection  $\pi(\mathcal{K}) = S^* \Gamma$  (see also [25], Theorem 21.4.8).

Consider a  $C^1$  family of Riemannian metrics  $[0, \delta_0] \ni t \rightarrow g_t$  in  $\tilde{X}$  and suppose that  $\Gamma$  is locally strictly geodesically convex in  $(\tilde{X}, g_0)$  with respect to the outward normal field at  $\Gamma$ . Choosing  $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$  sufficiently small we obtain by (5.38) that  $\Gamma$  remains locally strictly geodesically convex in  $(\tilde{X}, g_t)$  for any  $t \in [0, \delta]$ . We denote by  $\Sigma_{j,t} = \{f_{j,t} = 0\}$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ , the corresponding pairs of glancing hypersurfaces. Here  $f_{1,t} + 1$  is the Hamiltonian corresponding to the Riemannian metric  $g_t$  via the Legendre transform and  $f_{2,t} = f_2$ , hence, both families of Hamiltonians are  $C^1$  smooth with respect to  $t$ . Moreover,  $f_{j,t}$  satisfy (5.38) for  $t \in [0, \delta]$  and we denote by  $\mathcal{K}_t$  the corresponding glancing manifolds. Consider the corresponding  $C^1$  family of billiard ball maps  $B_t : U_t \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_t^* \Gamma$ ,  $t \in [0, \delta]$ , where  $U_t$  are suitable open subsets of  $\mathbf{B}_t^* \Gamma$ . The map  $B_t$  is exact symplectic and smooth in  $U_t$ , and it is extended by continuity as the identity map on  $S^* \Gamma$ . Using the construction of the local symplectic normal form of  $B_t$  at  $S^* \Gamma$  in [41] and the interpolating Hamiltonian introduced by Marvizi and Melrose [39] we obtain below a  $C^1$  family of Birkhoff Normal Forms of  $B_t$ ,  $t \in [0, \delta]$ .

From now on we suppose that  $\dim \tilde{X} = 2$  and we denote by  $2\pi l_t$  the length of  $\Gamma$  with respect to the Riemannian metric  $g_t$ . Set  $\mathbb{A}_t := \mathbb{T} \times (l_t - \varepsilon, l_t + \varepsilon)$ , where  $\varepsilon > 0$  will be chosen below small enough. Denote by  $\text{pr} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$  the canonical projection.

**Proposition 5.1** *Let  $(X, g_t)$ ,  $t \in [0, \delta]$ , be a  $C^1$  family of connected locally strictly geodesically convex billiard tables in  $\tilde{X}$ . Then there exists*

- (1) *a  $C^1$ -family of exact symplectic transformation  $[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_t \in C^\infty(\mathbb{A}_t, V_t)$ , where  $V_t := \tilde{\chi}_t(\mathbb{A}) \subset T^*\Gamma$  is a neighborhood of  $S_t^*\Gamma$ ,  $\tilde{\chi}_t(\mathbb{T} \times \{l_t\}) = S_t^*\Gamma$  and  $\tilde{\chi}_t(\mathbb{T} \times (l_t - \varepsilon, l_t)) \subset \mathbf{B}_t^*\Gamma$ ,*
- (2) *a  $C^1$ -family of real valued functions  $\zeta_t \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  and  $G_t \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{A}_t)$ ,  $t \in [0, \delta]$ , with  $\zeta_t(l_t) = 0$  and  $\zeta'_t(l_t) < 0$*

*such that the following holds*

- (i) *the function  $\tilde{G}_t \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$  defined by*

$$\tilde{G}_t(x, r) := xr - \frac{2}{3}\zeta_t(r)^{\frac{3}{2}} - G_t(\text{pr}(x), r)$$

*is a generating function of the symplectic map  $\tilde{P}_t := \tilde{\chi}_t^{-1} \circ B_t \circ \tilde{\chi}_t$  in  $\mathbb{T} \times (l_t - \varepsilon, l_t)$ ,*

- (ii)  *$G_t$  is flat at  $r = l_t$ , which means that  $\partial_r^\alpha G_t(\theta, l_t) = 0$  for any  $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ .*

The function  $\tilde{\zeta}_t := \zeta_t \circ \chi_t^{-1}$  is an interpolating Hamiltonian of  $B_t$  in the sense of Marvizi and Melrose [39], which means that for any  $\varphi \in C^\infty(T^*\Gamma)$ , the function

$$\varphi \circ B_t - \varphi \circ \exp\left(\tilde{\zeta}_t^{\frac{1}{2}} X_{\tilde{\zeta}}\right)$$

is flat at  $S_t^*\Gamma$ , where  $t \rightarrow \exp(tX_{\tilde{\zeta}})$  is the flow of the Hamiltonian vector field  $X_{\tilde{\zeta}}$  of  $\tilde{\zeta}$  on  $T^*\Gamma$ .

*Proof.* The proof of the Proposition is based on a local normal form of pairs of glancing hypersurfaces near the glancing manifold obtained by Melrose in [41]. Consider the two involutions  $\mathcal{J}_{j,t}$  associated to the characteristic foliations of  $\Sigma_{j,t} = \{f_{j,t} = 0\}$  in a neighborhood  $U_t$  of the glancing manifold  $\mathcal{K}_t$  in  $\Sigma_t := \Sigma_{1,t} \cap \Sigma_{2,t}$  for  $t \in [0, \delta]$ . In this way one obtains a  $C^1$  family of billiard ball maps given by the compositions  $\mathcal{J}_t = \mathcal{J}_{2,t} \circ \mathcal{J}_{1,t} : U_t \rightarrow U_t$  and  $B_t = \pi_t \circ \mathcal{J}_{1,t} \circ \pi_t^+$ . Arguing as in the proof of [25], Theorem C.4.8, we first obtain a  $C^1$  family of normal forms of the two involutions  $\mathcal{J}_{j,t}$ . More precisely, following the first part of the proof of that theorem we get a  $C^1$  family of diffeomorphisms  $\tilde{\Psi}_t : V \rightarrow U_t$ , where  $V$  is a neighborhood of a point  $z^0 = (z_1^0, 0, z'^0) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n-2}$  such that

$$\tilde{\Psi}_t^{-1} \circ \mathcal{J}_{1,t} \circ \tilde{\Psi}_t(z_1, z_2, z') = (z_1 + z_2, -z_2, z') + O_N(z_2^N),$$

$$\tilde{\Psi}_t^{-1} \circ \mathcal{J}_{2,t} \circ \tilde{\Psi}_t(z_1, z_2, z') = (z_1, -z_2, z')$$

for any  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ . In order to do this we consider an asymptotic expansion of  $\tilde{\Psi}_t$  in formal power series  $\tilde{\Psi}_t(z_1, z_2, z') \approx \sum \tilde{\Psi}_{t,k}(z_1, z')z_2^k$ . The functions  $\tilde{\Psi}_{t,k}(z_1, z')$  are obtained by solving linear systems of ordinary differential equations (see the proof of [25], Theorem C.4.8). In this way we obtain that the maps  $t \rightarrow \tilde{\Psi}_{t,k} \in C^\infty(V)$  are  $C^1$  smooth, and then using Borel's extension theorem we get a  $C^1$  smooth family of maps  $\psi_t : V \rightarrow U_t$  such that

$$|\tilde{\Psi}_t(z_1, z_2, z') - \sum_{k=0}^n \tilde{\Psi}_{t,k}(z_1, z')z_2^k| \leq C_N |z_2|^N.$$

Then following the proof of Theorem 21.4.4 in [25] (see also [12]) one finds a  $C^1$  family of diffeomorphisms  $\Psi_t$  defined by  $\Psi_t^{-1} : W \rightarrow U_t$ , where  $W$  is a neighborhood of a point  $\varrho^0 = (x_1^0, x^{0'}, 0, \xi^{0'}) \in T^*\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ ,  $U_t := \Psi_t^{-1}(W)$  is an open neighborhood of the glancing manifold  $\mathcal{K}_t$  in  $\Sigma_{1,t} \cap \Sigma_{2,t}$  and such that

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (\Psi_t^{-1})^*(\omega|_{\Sigma_t}) = dx_1 \wedge d(\xi_1^2) + \sum_{k=2}^{n-1} dx_k \wedge d\xi_k \\ \Psi_t \circ \mathcal{J}_{1,t} \circ \Psi_t^{-1}(x_1, x', \xi_1, \xi') = (x_1 + \xi_1, x', -\xi_1, \xi') + \tilde{R}_t(x, \xi), \\ \Psi_t \circ \mathcal{J}_{2,t} \circ \Psi_t^{-1}(x_1, x', \xi_1, \xi') = (x_1, x', -\xi_1, \xi') \\ \forall j \in \mathbb{N}, \partial_{\xi_1}^j \tilde{R}_t(x, 0, \xi') = 0. \end{array} \right. \quad (5.39)$$

We mention just for information that the formal power series are not convergent in general even when the hypersurfaces are analytic. It has been proved in [12] that for any  $t$  fixed the corresponding functions in (5.39) belong to the Gevrey class  $G^2$  of index two if the glancing hypersurfaces are analytic.

Suppose now that  $\Sigma_{1,t} = S_t^* \tilde{X}$  and  $\Sigma_{2,t} = T^* \tilde{X}|_{\Gamma}$ . Then  $U_t$  is an open subset of  $S_t^* \tilde{X}|_{\Gamma}$ . Choosing normal to  $\Gamma$  coordinates with respect to the metric  $g_t$  one can assume that locally  $f_{1,t}(y, y_n, \eta, \eta_n) = y_n$  and  $f_{2,t}(y, y_n, \eta, \eta_n) = \eta_n^2 + q_t(y, y_n, \eta)$ , where  $t \rightarrow q_t(y, y_n, \eta)$  is a  $C^1$  family of quadratic forms with respect to  $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{n-1})$  and  $q_t(y, 0, \eta)$  is the Hamiltonian corresponding to the induced metric on  $\Gamma$  via the Legendre transform. In these coordinates  $U_t$  can be identified with the set of  $(y, y_n, \eta, \eta_n)$ , where  $y_n = 0$ ,  $(y, \eta)$  are local coordinates in  $T^*\Gamma$  near a point  $\varrho_t^0 \in S_t^* \Gamma$  and  $\eta_n^2 + q_t(y, 0, \eta, \eta_n) = 1$ , while  $\mathcal{K}_t \subset U_t$  is given by  $y_n = \eta_n = 0$ . Moreover,  $\mathcal{J}_{2,t}(y, 0, \eta, -\eta_n) = -\mathcal{J}_{2,t}(y, 0, \eta, \eta_n)$  and  $\pi_t^\pm(y, \eta) = \pm \sqrt{1 - q_t(y, 0, \eta)}$  for  $(y, \eta) \in \mathbf{B}_t^* \Gamma$ . Setting

$$\Psi_t(y, \eta, \eta_n) = (x_t(y, \eta, \eta_n), \xi_{t1}(y, \eta, \eta_n), \xi'_t(y, \eta, \eta_n))$$

where  $\eta_n^2 + q_t(y, 0, \eta, \eta_n) = 1$  one obtains from the third relation of (5.39) that  $x_t$  and  $\xi'_t$  are even functions of  $\eta_n$  while  $\xi_{t1}$  is odd. Then there exists a  $C^1$  family of functions  $t \rightarrow (\tilde{x}_t, \tilde{\xi}_t) \in C^\infty(T^*\mathbb{R}^{n-1})$  such that

$$\Psi_t(y, 0, \eta, \eta_n) = (\tilde{x}_t(y, \eta, \eta_n^2), \eta_n \tilde{\xi}_{t1}(y, \eta, \eta_n^2), \tilde{\xi}'_t(y, \eta, \eta_n^2)),$$

where  $\eta_n^2 + q_t(y, 0, \eta) = 1$ .

We define a  $C^1$  family of diffeomorphisms  $\tilde{\chi}_t$  by

$$\tilde{\chi}_t^{-1}(y, \eta) = (\tilde{x}_t(y, \eta, \tilde{\eta}_n), \tilde{\eta}_n \tilde{\xi}_{t1}(y, \eta, \tilde{\eta}_n)^2, \tilde{\xi}'_t(y, \eta, \tilde{\eta}_n)),$$

where  $\tilde{\eta}_n := 1 - q_t(y, 0, \eta)$ . Then  $\tilde{\chi}_t : V \rightarrow V_t := \tilde{\chi}_t(V) \subset T^*\Gamma$  is a  $C^1$  family of symplectic mappings, i.e.

$$\tilde{\chi}_t^* \left( \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} dy_j \wedge d\eta_j \right) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} dx_j \wedge d\xi_j,$$

where  $V \subset T^*\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  is an open neighborhood of a given point  $(x^0, 0, \xi^{0'})$  and we get the following symplectic normal form of the billiard ball maps

$$\tilde{\chi}_t^{-1} \circ B_t \circ \tilde{\chi}_t(x_1, x', \xi_1, \xi') = (x_1 + \sqrt{\xi_1}, x', \xi_1, \xi') + R_t(x, \xi),$$

where  $t \rightarrow R_t \in C^\infty(T^*\mathbb{R}^{n-1}, T^*\mathbb{R}^{n-1})$  is a  $C^1$  family of maps such that  $\partial_{\xi_1}^j R_t(x, 0, \xi') = 0$  for any  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . The interpolating Hamiltonian  $\tilde{\zeta}_t$  is defined by the  $\xi_1$  component of  $\tilde{\chi}_t^{-1}$ , i.e.

$$\tilde{\zeta}_t(y, \eta) = (1 - q_t(y, 0, \eta))\tilde{\xi}_{t1}(y, \eta, 1 - q_t(y, 0, \eta))^2.$$

As in [39] and [51] one obtains that  $\tilde{\zeta}_t$  is uniquely defined modulo a flat function on  $S_t^*\Gamma$ .

We suppose now that  $\dim \Gamma = 2$ . To obtain the Hamiltonian  $\zeta_t$  we find action-angle coordinates of  $\tilde{\zeta}_t$  as in [51]. To simplify the notations we drop the index  $t$ . Denote by  $M_u$  the closed curve  $\{\varrho \in T^*\Gamma : \tilde{\zeta}(\varrho) = u\}$  in  $T^*\Gamma$  where  $u$  varies in a small neighborhood of the origin. For any  $\varrho \in M_u$  consider the map  $\mathbb{R} \ni t \rightarrow \exp(tX_{\tilde{\zeta}})(\varrho) \in M_u$  and denote by  $2\pi\Pi(u)$  its period. Let  $S$  be a section transversal to  $M_0$  in  $T^*\Gamma$ . It is equipped with local coordinates  $S \ni \varrho \rightarrow u = \tilde{\zeta}(\varrho)$ . Denote by  $\mathcal{O}$  the discrete group in  $\mathbb{R} \times S$  generated by

$$\mathbb{R} \times S \ni (t, u) \rightarrow (t + 2\pi\Pi(u), u), \quad u = \tilde{\zeta}(\varrho).$$

Let  $(\mathbb{R} \times S)/\mathcal{O}$  be the corresponding factor space. It is a symplectic manifold equipped with the symplectic two-form  $dt \wedge du$  and the mapping

$$\mathbb{R} \times S \ni (t, \varrho) \rightarrow \exp(tX_{\tilde{\zeta}})(\varrho) \in T^*\Gamma$$

lifts to a symplectic diffeomorphism from  $(\mathbb{R} \times S)/\mathcal{O}$  to a neighborhood of  $M_0$ . Making suitable symplectic change of the variables

$$\theta = t/\Pi(u), \quad r = g(u),$$

in  $\mathbb{R} \times S$  we can suppose that  $\mathcal{O}$  is generated by  $(\theta, r) \rightarrow (\theta + 2\pi, r)$  while the symplectic two-form becomes  $d\theta \wedge dr$ . Then  $g'(u) = -\Pi(u)$  which yields

$$r(u) = l - \int_0^u \Pi(t) dt, \tag{5.40}$$

where  $l = \text{length}(\Gamma)/2\pi$ . Denote by  $\zeta(r)$  the function inverse to  $r(u)$ .

We have obtained symplectic coordinates  $(\theta_t(x, \xi), r_t(x, \xi))$ ,  $t \in [0, \delta]$ , in a neighborhood of the boundary  $S_t^*\Gamma$  in the co-ball bundle of  $\Gamma$  with values in  $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}$  such that  $S_t^*\Gamma = \{r_t = l_t\}$  and  $\mathbf{B}_t^* \subset \{r_t < l_t\}$ . The map  $t \rightarrow (\theta_t, r_t) \in C^\infty(T^*\Gamma)$  is  $C^1$  by construction. The exact symplectic map  $B_t$  is generated in this coordinates by the function  $\tilde{G}_t$ .  $\square$

Recall that the functions  $\beta_t(\omega)$ ,  $I_t(\omega)$  and  $L_t(I)$  are defined by (1.5), (1.6) and (1.7) respectively.

**Theorem 5.2** *Let  $(X, g_t)$ ,  $t \in [0, \delta]$ , be a  $C^1$  family of compact locally strictly geodesically convex billiard tables of dimension two satisfying the weak isospectral condition  $(H_1) - (H_2)$ . Then*

(i) *There is a Cantor set  $\Xi \subset (0, 1]$  consisting of Diophantine numbers such that*

$$\frac{\text{meas}(\Xi \cap (0, \varepsilon))}{\varepsilon} = 1 - O(\varepsilon^2) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$$

*and for any  $\omega \in \Xi$  there exists a  $C^1$  family of Kronecker invariant circles  $[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow \Lambda_t(\omega)$  of  $B_t$  of frequency  $\omega$ ,*

- (ii)  $\forall \omega \in \Xi$  and  $t \in [0, \delta]$ ,  $\beta_t(\omega) = \beta_0(\omega)$ ,  $I_t(\omega) = I_0(\omega)$  and  $L_t(I_0(\omega)) = L_0(I_0(\omega))$ ,  
 (iii)  $l_t = r_0$  and the function  $\zeta_t - \zeta_0$  is flat at  $r_0$  for any  $t \in [0, \delta]$ .

We are going to prove Theorem 5.2. Firstly, using Theorem 9.10 we will obtain a suitable KAM theorem and a BNF at the corresponding family of invariant circles for the  $C^1$  family of symplectic maps  $\tilde{P}_t$  given by Proposition 5.1. To this end we will determine the convex set  $\Omega$ , fix the parameters  $\kappa$  and  $\varrho$ , and then estimate the corresponding quantities  $\mathcal{B}_\ell$  and  $\lambda$  which appear in Theorem 9.10.

Consider the function  $K_t := -\frac{2}{3}\zeta_t^{\frac{3}{2}}$  in  $[l_t - \varepsilon, l_t]$ . Fix  $\varepsilon > 0$  so that  $\zeta'_t(r) < 0$  for  $(r, t) \in [l_t - \varepsilon, l_t] \times [0, \delta]$ , and denote by  $K_t^*$  the Legendre transform of  $K_t$  in an interval  $[0, a_0]$ ,  $0 < a_0 \ll 1$ . One can easily show that the family  $t \rightarrow K_t^*$  can be extended as a  $C^1$  family of smooth odd functions  $[0, \delta] \ni t \mapsto K_t^* \in C^\infty([-a_0, a_0])$ . Indeed, the function  $K_t$  admits an asymptotic expansion of the form

$$K_t(r) \approx -\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\frac{1}{2} + k} (l_t - r)^{\frac{1}{2} + k} u_k(t) \quad \text{as } r \nearrow l_t,$$

where  $u_k \in C^1([0, \delta])$  and  $u_1(t) = (-\zeta'_t(l_t))^{\frac{3}{2}} > 0$ . Moreover, this asymptotic expansion can be differentiated infinitely many times with respect to  $r$ . Recall that for any  $t \in [0, \delta]$  fixed the derivative  $K_t^{* \prime}$  of  $K_t^*$  satisfies the identity  $K_t'(K_t^{* \prime}(\omega)) = \omega$  for any  $\omega \in (0, a_0]$ . Moreover,  $K_t(K_t^{* \prime}(\omega)) + K_t^*(\omega) = \omega K_t^{* \prime}(\omega)$ ,  $K_t^{* \prime}(0) = l_t$ , and we easily obtain the asymptotic expansion

$$K_t^*(r) \approx \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2k+1} \omega^{2k+1} v_k(t) \quad \text{as } \omega \searrow 0,$$

where  $v_k \in C^1([0, \delta])$ ,

$$v_0(t) = l_t, \quad v_1(t) = -u_1(t)^{-2} = -(-\zeta'_t(l_t))^{-3} < 0,$$

and so on.

Fix  $\tau > 1$ , set  $\Omega(a) := [a/2, 2a]$ , choose  $\kappa_a = a^2$  and denote by  $\Omega_\kappa(a)$  the set of Diophantine frequencies  $[a/2 + a^2, 2a - a^2] \cap D(\kappa, \tau)$ . It follows from [37], Proposition 9.9, that

$$\frac{\text{meas}(\Omega(a) \setminus \Omega_\kappa(a))}{\text{meas}(\Omega(a))} \leq C \kappa = C a^2. \quad (5.41)$$

Choose  $a_0 > 0$  so that the Lebesgue measure of  $\Omega_\kappa(a_0)$  is positive and denote by  $\Omega_\kappa^0(a)$  the set of points of  $\Omega_\kappa(a)$  of positive Lebesgue density. We have

$$\mathbb{D}(t, a) := K_t^{* \prime}(\Omega(a)) = [l_t + v_1(t)a^2/4 + O(a^4), l_t + 4v_1(t)a^2 + O(a^4)] \subset [l_t - \varepsilon, l_t] \quad (5.42)$$

for  $0 < a \leq a_0 \ll 1$ . Set  $\mathbb{A}(t, a) = \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{D}(t, a)$ . We are ready to announce the corresponding KAM theorem for the  $C^1$  family of symplectic mappings  $[0, \delta] \ni t \mapsto \tilde{P}_t$  with generating functions  $\tilde{G}_t$  satisfying (i) and (ii) in Proposition 5.1.

**Theorem 5.3** *For any  $a \in (0, a_0]$  there exists a  $C^1$ -family of exact symplectic maps*

$$[0, \delta] \ni t \mapsto (\chi_t : \mathbb{A}(t, a) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}(t, a))$$

*and of real valued functions  $[0, \delta] \ni t \mapsto L_t \in C^\infty(\mathbb{D}(t, a))$  and  $[0, \delta] \ni t \mapsto R_t \in C^\infty(\mathbb{A}(t, a))$  such that for any  $t \in [0, \delta]$  the following holds*

1.  $\tilde{G}_t^0(x, I) = xI - L_t(I) - R_t(\text{pr}(x), I)$  is a generating function of  $P_t^0 := \chi_t^{-1} \circ \tilde{P}_t \circ \chi_t$
2.  $L_t' : \mathbb{D}(t, a) \rightarrow \Omega(a)$  is a diffeomorphism with inverse  $L_t^{*'} : \Omega(a) \rightarrow \mathbb{D}(t, a)$ , where  $L_t^*$  is the Legendre transform of  $L_t$
3.  $R_t$  is flat at  $\mathbb{T} \times L_t^{*'}(\Omega_\kappa^0(a))$
4. for any integer  $N \geq 1$  and  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists a constant  $C = C_{m,N} > 0$  independent of  $a \in (0, a_0]$  and  $t \in [0, \delta]$  such that the following estimates hold

$$|\partial_\varphi^\alpha (\kappa \partial_\omega)^\beta \sigma_\kappa^{-1}(\chi_s - \text{id})| + |\partial_\varphi^\alpha (\kappa \partial_\omega)^\beta \sigma_\kappa^{-1}(\chi_s^{-1} - \text{id})| \leq C \kappa^{2N-m-\frac{3}{4}}$$

on  $\mathbb{A}(t, a)$ , and

$$\left| \left( \kappa \frac{d}{dI} \right)^m (L_t'(I) - K_t'(I)) \right| \leq C \kappa^{2N-m+\frac{1}{4}} \quad (5.43)$$

on  $\mathbb{D}(t, a)$  for any  $t \in [0, \delta]$  and  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ .

*Proof.* We are going to apply Theorem 9.10 to the  $C^1$  family of symplectic mappings  $[0, \delta] \ni t \mapsto \tilde{P}_t \in C^\infty(\mathbb{A}(t, a), \mathbb{A}(t, a))$  given by Proposition 5.1.

Let us estimate the corresponding quantities  $\mathcal{B}_m$  for  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\lambda$  defined by (9.176) - (9.178) and (9.184). The constant  $\lambda$  can be fixed by

$$\lambda = \lambda_a = \sup_{t \in [0, \delta]} \|K_t''\|_{\mathbb{D}(t, a); \kappa} = C_0 a^{-1} = C_0 \kappa^{-1/2}, \quad (5.44)$$

where  $C_0$  is a positive constant independent of  $a$ . Given  $\ell = m + \mu$  with  $m \in \mathbb{N}_*$  we get by (4.32) that for any  $t \in [0, \delta]$  the following inequality holds

$$\|G_t\|_{\ell, \mathbb{A}(t, a); \kappa} \leq \|G_t\|_{m+1, \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{D}(t, a); \kappa}.$$

since  $\mathbb{D}(t, a)$  is an interval. Moreover,

$$\|G_t\|_{m+1, \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{D}_a; \kappa} = \sup_{|\alpha|+|\beta| \leq m+1} \|\partial_\theta^\alpha (\kappa \partial_r)^\beta G_t\|_{C^0(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{D}(t, a))}.$$

Fix  $N \geq 2$ . It follows from Proposition 5.1, (ii), and the definition of  $\mathbb{D}(t, a)$  that

$$\|G_t\|_{\ell, \mathbb{A}(t, a); \kappa} \leq C_{m,N} a^{8N+4} = C_{m,N} \kappa^{4N+2}$$

for any  $t \in [0, \delta]$ , where  $C_{m,N}$  is a positive constant. Choosing  $\varrho = \kappa^{2N+5/4} < \kappa$  we obtain

$$\|G_t\|_{\ell, \mathbb{A}(t, a); \kappa} \leq C'_m \kappa \varrho \kappa^{2N-1/4}$$

for any  $t \in [0, \delta]$ . Moreover,

$$\|K_t''\|_{\ell, \mathbb{D}(t, a); \kappa} \leq \|K_t''\|_{m+1, \mathbb{D}(t, a); \kappa} \leq C_m a^{-1} = C_m \kappa^{-1/2} \quad (5.45)$$

and

$$S_\ell(\nabla K^*) \leq \sup_{0 \leq t \leq \delta} (1 + \|\nabla K_t^*\|_{C^1([-a_0, a_0])})^{\ell-1} (1 + \|\nabla K_t^*\|_{C^\ell([-a_0, a_0])}) \leq C_m$$

where  $C_m$  is a positive constant. Thus for any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  we obtain from (9.176) - (9.178) that

$$\mathcal{B}_m \leq C'_m \mathcal{B}_m^0 \leq C_\ell \varrho \kappa^{2N+3/4} = C_\ell \kappa \varrho \kappa^{2N-1/4} \quad (5.46)$$

where  $C_m, C'_m > 0$  depends neither on  $a \in (0, a_0]$  nor on  $t \in [0, \delta]$ . Choosing  $a_0 \ll 1$  we get  $\mathcal{B}_2 \leq \epsilon \kappa \varrho \lambda^{-4}$  for any  $a \in (0, a_0]$  since  $N \geq 2$  and  $\lambda = C_0 \kappa^{-1/2}$ , which gives (9.185). Applying Theorem 9.10 we obtain 1-4. In particular, taking into account (5.44) - (5.46) we obtain from (9.187) the estimate

$$\sup_{t \in [0, \delta]} \sup_{I \in \mathbb{D}(t, a)} \left| \left( \kappa \frac{d}{dI} \right)^m (L'_t(I) - K'_t(I)) \right| \leq C'_m \kappa^{2N+\frac{3}{4}} \lambda^{2m} (\lambda + \kappa^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \leq C_m \kappa^{2N-m+\frac{1}{4}}$$

for any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , where  $C'_m$  and  $C_m$  are positive constants.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 5.2.* It follows from Theorem 5.3 that for any  $0 < a \leq a_0 \ll 1$  and  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0(a)$  with  $\kappa = a^2$  there exists a  $C^1$  family of Kronecker invariant tori  $[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow \Lambda_t(\omega)$  of  $B_t$ . Corollary 2 implies that  $I_t(\omega) = I_0(\omega)$  and  $L'_t(I_0(\omega)) = L'_0(I_0(\omega))$ . Notice that

$$\limsup_{a \rightarrow 0} \{I_t(\omega) - l_t : \omega \in [a/2, 2a]\} = 0.$$

Then

$$|l_t - l_0| \leq \limsup_{a \rightarrow 0} \{I_t(\omega) - l_t : \omega \in [a/2, 2a]\} + \limsup_{a \rightarrow 0} \{I_0(\omega) - r_0 : \omega \in [a/2, 2a]\} = 0$$

hence,  $l_t = l_0$  for any  $t \in [0, \delta]$ . Moreover, the function  $\omega \mapsto L'_t(I_0(\omega)) - L'_0(I_0(\omega))$  is flat at the set  $\Omega_\kappa^0(a)$  in view of Lemma 6.3. Then for any  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0(a)$ ,  $t \in [0, \delta]$ , and any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  using the equality  $I_t(\omega) = I_0(\omega)$  and the estimate (5.43) with  $N = m$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |(d/dI)^m (K'_t - K'_0)(I_0(\omega))| &\leq |(d/dI)^m (K'_t - L'_t)(I_t(\omega))| \\ &\quad + |(d/dI)^m (K'_0 - L'_0)(I_0(\omega))| \\ &\leq C \kappa^{1/4} = C a^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit as  $a \searrow 0$  we obtain that the function  $K_t - K_0$  is smooth in  $[r_0, r_0 + \varepsilon]$  and flat at  $r_0$ . Then  $\zeta_t - \zeta_0 = (3K_t/2)^{2/3} - (3K_0/2)^{2/3}$  is also flat at  $r_0$ . The set of frequencies  $\Xi$  is defined as the union of  $\Omega_\kappa^0(a)$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 4.* It remains to show that  $\Gamma_t$  is strictly convex for any  $t \in [0, 1]$ . To do this we are going to use an argument from [51]. To simplify the notations we will omit the index  $t \in [0, 1]$ .

Consider the interpolating Hamiltonian  $\tilde{\zeta}(x, \xi) = \zeta(\tilde{\chi}^{-1}(x, \xi))$  of  $B$ , where the function  $\zeta$  and the symplectic transformation  $\tilde{\chi}$  are given by Proposition 5.1. For any  $r$  with  $|r|$  small enough the level set

$$M(r) = \{(x, \xi) \in T^*\Gamma : \tilde{\zeta}(x, \xi) = r\}$$

is an “circle” and we set

$$\nu(r) = \int_{M(r)} d(z|_{M(r)}) \quad (5.47)$$

where  $r \rightarrow d(z|_{M(r)})$  is a smooth family of 1-forms on  $M(r)$  such that  $d(z|_{M(r)})(X_{\tilde{\zeta}}) = 1$ . One can consider  $z|_{M(r)}$  as a multivalued function on the circle  $M(r)$  which is well defined on the corresponding covering space  $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow M(r)$  so that

$$\{\tilde{\zeta}, z\} = dz(X_{\tilde{\zeta}}) = 1. \quad (5.48)$$

It is easy to show that the set of Taylor coefficients of  $\nu(r)$  at  $r = 0$  is algebraically equivalent to the set of Taylor's coefficients of  $\zeta(I)$  at  $I = l$ . Indeed, performing the symplectic change of the variables  $(x, \xi) = \tilde{\chi}(\varphi, I)$ ,  $(\varphi, I) \in \mathbb{A}$ , and using (5.48) we easily get

$$\zeta'(I)\nu(\zeta(I)) = 2\pi.$$

Denote by  $\mathcal{R}_r$  the function inverse to  $I \rightarrow \zeta(I)$ . Then (5.47) implies

$$\nu(r) = 2\pi\mathcal{R}'(r) \quad (5.49)$$

and we obtain that the Taylor coefficients of  $\nu(r)$  at  $r = 0$  determine those of  $\zeta$  at  $I = l$  and vice versa.

The Taylor coefficients of  $\nu(r)$  at  $r = 0$ , also called integral invariants, have been investigated by Sh. Marvizi and R. Melrose [39]. They are given by integrals on  $\Gamma$  of certain polynomials of the curvature  $\kappa(x)$  of  $\Gamma$  and its derivatives. In particular, (4.6) in [39] and (5.49) yield together

$$\mathcal{R}'(0) = -\frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\ell \kappa(x)^{2/3} dx \quad (5.50)$$

$$\mathcal{R}''(0) = \frac{1}{2160\pi} \int_0^\ell (9\kappa(x)^{4/3} + 8\kappa(x)^{-8/3}\kappa'(x)^2) dx \quad (5.51)$$

(see also [62]).

Suppose now that  $X_t$  is strictly convex for  $0 \leq t < \delta$  but only convex for  $t = \delta$ . Consider the function  $\mathcal{R}_t(r)$  inverse to  $r = \zeta_t(I)$ . Then Theorem 5.2, (iii), yields

$$\mathcal{R}_t(r) = \mathcal{R}_0(r) + O_N(r^N) \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow 0$$

for any  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and we obtain

$$\mathcal{R}'_t(0) = \mathcal{R}'_0(0), \quad \mathcal{R}''_t(0) = \mathcal{R}''_0(0), \quad s \in [0, b_0). \quad (5.52)$$

Denote by  $\kappa_t(x) > 0$ ,  $x \in \Gamma_t$  the curvature of  $\Gamma_t$  and define  $f_\delta$  by  $f_t(x) = \kappa_t(x)^{-1/3}$  for  $t < \delta$  and  $f_\delta(x) = \kappa_\delta(x)^{-1/3}$  if  $\kappa_\delta(x) \neq 0$  and  $f_\delta(x) = 0$  if  $\kappa_\delta(x) = 0$ . The second equality of (5.52) and (5.51) yield together

$$\int_{\Gamma_t} |f'_t(x)|^2 dx \leq C, \quad s \in [0, \delta). \quad (5.53)$$

where  $C$  is a positive constant. On the other hand, the first equality of (5.52) and (5.50) imply that for any  $t \in [0, \delta)$  there exists  $x_t \in \Gamma_t$  such that

$$\kappa_t(x_t) \geq C_1 := \left(-\frac{\pi}{l_0}\mathcal{R}'_0(0)\right)^{3/2} > 0.$$

Then  $f_t(x_t) \leq C_1^{-1/3}$  for  $t \in [0, \delta)$ , and using Taylor's formula and (5.53) we obtain the estimate

$$\int_{\Gamma_t} (|f_t(x)|^2 + |f'_t(x)|^2) dx \leq C_2, \quad s \in [0, \delta),$$

where  $C_2$  is a positive constant. Let  $[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow \psi_t : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  be a  $C^1$  family of embeddings such that  $\Gamma_0 = \Gamma$  and  $\psi_t(\Gamma) = \Gamma_t$ . Then  $\{f_t \circ \psi_t : t \in [0, \delta)\}$  is a compact subset of  $L^2(\Gamma)$  and we obtain that  $f_\delta \circ \psi_\delta \in L^2(\Gamma)$  as well. On the other hand,  $\Gamma_\delta$  is convex but not strictly convex, hence the curvature its curvature  $k_\delta$  is a non-negative function and it has a zero of at least second order at a point  $x_0 \in \Gamma$ . Then

$$|f_\delta(x)| \geq C |x - x_0|^{-2/3}$$

in any local coordinates in a neighborhood of  $x_0$  in  $\Gamma_\delta$ . Hence  $f_\delta \notin L^2(\Gamma)$  which leads to a contradiction. This implies that  $\Gamma_t$  is strictly convex for any  $t \in [0, 1]$ .  $\square$

## 6 Birkhoff Normal Forms of $C^1$ deformations.

The aim of this section is to prove items 1 and 2 of Theorem 1. We shall obtain a  $C^1$  family of Birkhoff Normal Forms for the  $C^1$  family of exact symplectic maps  $t \rightarrow P_t$  around the corresponding invariant tori. This BNF will be essentially used in the next section to construct a  $C^1$  family of Quantum Birkhoff Normal Forms. In order to obtain the BNF we will apply Theorem 9.10 to a suitable  $C^1$  family of exact symplectic mappings  $\tilde{P}_t$  which will be constructed below.

Let  $[0, 1] \ni t \mapsto P_t \in C^\infty(U, U)$  be a  $C^1$  family of exact symplectic maps where  $U \subset T^*\Gamma$  is an open set. Suppose that  $P_0$  has a Kronecker torus  $\Lambda_0(\omega_0)$  with frequency  $\omega_0 \in D(\kappa_0, \tau)$  where  $0 < \kappa_0 < 1$  and  $\tau > n - 1$ . Then  $P_0$  admits a Birkhoff Normal Form (BNF) at  $\Lambda_0(\omega_0)$  (cf [37], Proposition 9.13 and [56], Proposition 3.3) which means the following. There exists an exact symplectic transformation  $\tilde{\chi} : \mathbb{A} \rightarrow T^*\Gamma$ , where  $\mathbb{A} := \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times D \subset T^*\mathbb{T}^{n-1}$  and  $D$  is a neighborhood of  $I_0(\omega_0)$  given by (1.6),  $\tilde{\chi}(\mathbb{A})$  is a neighborhood of  $\Lambda_0(\omega_0)$ ,  $\tilde{\chi}(\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \{I_0(\omega_0)\}) = \Lambda_0(\omega_0)$  and the exact symplectic map  $\tilde{P}_0 := \tilde{\chi}^{-1} \circ P_0 \circ \tilde{\chi}$  has the form

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{P}_0(\theta, r) = (\theta + \nabla K(r), r) + R(\theta, r), \\ \partial_r^\alpha R(\theta, I_0(\omega_0)) = 0, \quad \forall \theta \in \mathbb{T}^{n-1}, \quad \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{n-1}. \end{cases} \quad (6.54)$$

Shrinking  $U$  if necessary we set  $U = \tilde{\chi}(\mathbb{A})$ . We suppose that the BNF is nondegenerate, which means that the Hessian matrix  $\partial^2 K(r_0)$  is nondegenerate at  $r_0 = I_0(\omega_0)$ . Shrinking  $D$  if necessary we suppose that the map  $\nabla K : D \rightarrow \nabla K(D) \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  is a diffeomorphism. Then there exists  $\bar{\delta} > 0$  such that the exact symplectic maps  $\tilde{P}_t = \tilde{\chi}^{-1} \circ P_t \circ \tilde{\chi}$  admit for  $0 \leq t \leq \bar{\delta}$  a  $C^1$  family of generating functions  $[0, \bar{\delta}] \ni t \rightarrow \tilde{G}_t \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times D)$  (in the sense of Definition 4.1) such that

$$\tilde{G}_t(x, r) = \langle x, r \rangle - K(r) - G_t(\text{pr}(x), r) \quad (6.55)$$

where the map  $t \rightarrow G_t \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times D)$  is  $C^1$ ,  $\text{pr} : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^{n-1}$  is the canonical projection and

$$\partial_r^\alpha G_0(\theta, I_0(\omega_0)) = 0 \quad \forall \theta \in \mathbb{T}^{n-1}, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{n-1}. \quad (6.56)$$

Consider the Legendre transform  $K^*$  of  $K$  in a ball  $B(\omega_0, \varepsilon)$  centered at  $\omega_0$  and with sufficiently small radius  $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ . Then  $\nabla K^* : B(\omega_0, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \nabla K^*(B(\omega_0, \varepsilon))$  becomes a diffeomorphism.

The union  $\cup_{0 < \kappa \leq \kappa_0} D(\kappa, \tau)$  of  $(\kappa, \tau)$ -Diophantine vectors is of full Lebesgue measure in  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  for  $\tau > n - 1$  fixed, and  $D(\kappa', \tau) \subset D(\kappa, \tau)$  for  $0 < \kappa < \kappa'$ , hence, there exists  $0 < \kappa_1 \leq \kappa_0$  such that  $\omega_0$  is a point of positive Lebesgue density in  $D(\kappa, \tau)$  for each  $0 < \kappa \leq \kappa_1$ . This means that the Lebesgue measure  $\text{meas}(D(\kappa, \tau) \cap V) > 0$  for any neighborhood  $V$  of  $\omega_0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ . We suppose that  $\kappa_1 \leq \varepsilon^2$  and for every  $0 < \kappa \leq \kappa_1 < 1$  we set

$$\Omega(\kappa) := B(\omega_0, \sqrt{\kappa}), \quad \Omega_\kappa := D(\kappa, \tau) \cap B(\omega_0, \sqrt{\kappa} - \kappa), \quad (6.57)$$

and denote by  $\Omega_\kappa^0$  the set of points of positive Lebesgue density of  $\Omega_\kappa$ . By definition  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$  if and only if  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa$  and  $\text{meas}(\Omega_\kappa \cap V) > 0$  for any neighborhood  $V$  of  $\omega$ .

It follows from [37], Proposition 9.9, that

$$\frac{\text{meas}(\Omega(\kappa) \setminus \Omega_\kappa)}{\text{meas}(\Omega(\kappa))} \leq C \kappa. \quad (6.58)$$

Moreover, there exists  $c > 0$  such that  $D(\kappa) := \nabla K(\Omega(\kappa)) \subset B(r_0, c\sqrt{\kappa})$  and (6.56) implies that for every  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^{n-1}$  and  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists  $C_{\alpha, \beta, N}$  such that

$$|\partial_\theta^\alpha \partial_r^\beta G_0(\theta, r)| \leq C_{\alpha, \beta, N} \kappa^N \quad \forall (\theta, r) \in \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times D(\kappa).$$

On the other hand,

$$|\partial_\theta^\alpha \partial_r^\beta (G(\theta, r) - G_0(\theta, r))| \leq C_{\alpha, \beta} t \quad \forall (\theta, r) \in \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times D(\kappa), \quad t \in [0, \bar{\delta}].$$

These inequalities allow us to apply Theorem 9.7 and Theorem 9.10. In this way we obtain the following

**Theorem 6.1** (*Birkhoff Normal Form*) *Let  $[0, 1] \ni t \rightarrow P_t \in C^\infty(U, U)$ ,  $U \subset T^*\Gamma$ , be a  $C^1$  family of symplectic maps. Let  $P_0$  have a Kronecker torus  $\Lambda_0(\omega_0)$  with a frequency  $\omega_0 \in D(\kappa_0, \tau)$  where  $0 < \kappa_0 \leq 1$  and  $\tau > n - 1$ . Suppose that the BNF of  $P_0$  at  $\Lambda_0(\omega_0)$  is nondegenerate. Then there exists  $0 < \kappa_1 \leq \kappa_0$  and for each  $0 < \kappa \leq \kappa_1$  there exists  $\delta = \delta(\kappa) > 0$  such that the following holds*

- (i) *For each  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa$  there exists a  $C^1$  family of Kronecker invariant tori  $[0, \delta(\kappa)] \ni t \rightarrow \Lambda_t(\omega)$  of  $P_t$  with a frequency  $\omega$ ;*
- (ii) *There exists a  $C^1$ -smooth with respect to  $t \in [0, \delta(\kappa)]$  family of exact symplectic maps  $\chi_t : \mathbb{A} \rightarrow U$  and of real valued functions  $L_t \in C^\infty(D)$  and  $R_t^0 \in C^\infty(\mathbb{A})$  such that*
  1.  *$\Lambda_t(\omega) = \chi_t(\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \{I_t(\omega)\})$  for each  $t \in [0, \delta(\kappa)]$  and  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$ , where  $I_t(\omega)$  is given by (1.6);*
  2. *The function  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times D \ni (x, I) \mapsto \phi_t(x, I) := \langle x, I \rangle - L_t(I) - R_t^0(x, I)$  is a generating function in the sense of Definition 4.1 of the exact symplectic map*

$$P_t^0 := \chi_t^{-1} \circ P_t \circ \chi_t : \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{A};$$

3.  *$\nabla L_t : D \rightarrow \Omega$  is a diffeomorphism,  $L_t = K$  outside  $D^1 := \nabla K^*(B(\omega_0, \sqrt{\kappa} - \frac{1}{2}\kappa))$  and  $\nabla L_t^*(\omega) = I_t(\omega)$  is given by (1.6) for each  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$ ;*

4.  $R_t^0$  is flat at  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times E_t^\kappa$ , where  $E_t^\kappa := \nabla L_t^*(\Omega_\kappa^0)$ .

Observe that each  $I \in E_t^\kappa$  is an element of positive Lebesgue density of  $E_t^\kappa$  since the map  $\nabla L_t^* : \Omega \rightarrow D$  is a diffeomorphism. We extend  $I_t$  as a  $C^1$  family of smooth functions setting

$$I_t(\omega) := \nabla L_t^*(\omega) \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega.$$

Then we have

$$P_t^0(\varphi, I) = (\varphi + \nabla L_t(I), I) + O_N(|I - I_t(\omega)|^N)$$

for each  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$  and  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ . This formula can be differentiated with respect to  $(\varphi, I)$  as many times as we want. To summarize we give the following

**Definition 6.2** *We say that the  $C^1$  family of exact symplectic maps  $P_t$ ,  $t \in [0, \delta]$ , admits a  $C^1$ -smooth family of nondegenerate Birkhoff Normal Forms associated with a  $C^1$  family of invariant tori  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$  with frequencies  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$  if item (ii) of Theorem 9.10 holds true.*

Recall as well that the complement of  $\Omega_\kappa^0$  in  $\Omega_\kappa$  is of Lebesgue measure zero.

*Proof of Theorem 1, item 2.* Take  $\kappa = \kappa_1$  in Theorem 6.1 and consider the Legendre transform  $L_t^* \in C^\infty(\Omega)$  of the function  $L_t$  for  $t \in [0, \delta(\kappa_1)]$ . It follows from Theorem 6.1, 2., that  $[0, \delta(\kappa_1)] \ni t \rightarrow \nabla L_t^* : \Omega \rightarrow D$  is a  $C^1$  family of diffeomorphisms. Applying Theorem 9.10 to the  $C^1$  family  $P_t^0 := \chi_t^{-1} \circ P_t \circ \chi_t$ ,  $t \in [0, \delta(\kappa_1)]$ , with generating functions given by Theorem 6.1, 2, we obtain for any  $0 < \kappa < \kappa_1$  a  $C^1$  family of Kronecker tori  $[0, \delta(\kappa_1)] \ni t \rightarrow \Lambda_t(\omega)$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$ , where  $\Omega_\kappa$  is defined in (6.57) and  $\Omega_\kappa^0$  is the set of points of positive Lebesgue density in  $\Omega_\kappa$ . Setting

$$\Xi := \bigcup_{0 < \kappa \leq \kappa_1} \Omega_\kappa^0 \quad (6.59)$$

we prove item 2 of Theorem 1. Item 1 follows from the uniqueness of the  $C^1$  family of Kronecker tori  $[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow \Lambda_t(\omega_0)$ .  $\square$

The advantage of working with  $\Omega_{\kappa_1}^0$  instead of  $\Omega_{\kappa_1}$  is given by the following

**Lemma 6.3** *Let  $\Omega$  be an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $d \geq 1$ . Let  $E \subset \Omega$  be a measurable set of positive Lebesgue measure and let  $E^0 \subset E$  be the set of points of positive Lebesgue density in  $E$ . Then any smooth function  $f$  on  $\Omega$  which is zero on  $E^0$  is flat at  $E^0$ , i.e. the equality  $f|_{E^0} = 0$  implies  $\partial^k f|_{E^0} = 0$  for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}^d$ . Moreover, the Lebesgue measure of  $E \setminus E^0$  is zero by construction.*

*Proof.* The result is evident when  $d = 1$ . Suppose that  $d \geq 2$ . Let  $\omega = (\omega_1, \omega') \in E^0$ . By Fubini's theorem, for any neighborhood  $U_1 \subset \mathbb{R}$  of  $\omega_1$  and  $U' \subset \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$  of  $\omega'$  there is  $z' \in U'$  and a set of positive Lebesgue measure  $V_1 \subset U_1$  such that  $(z_1, z') \in E^0$  for any  $z_1 \in V_1$ . Then  $f(z_1, z') = 0$  for any  $z_1 \in V_1$  and there is  $y_1 \in U_1$  such that  $\partial_1 f(y_1, z') = 0$ . By continuity we obtain  $\partial_1 f(\omega) = 0$ . In the same way we prove by induction that the restriction of  $\partial^\alpha f$  to  $\Omega_E^0$  is zero for any  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^d$ .  $\square$

We are going to give a relation between the function  $\beta_t$  defined by (1.5) and the restrictions on  $\Omega_\kappa^0$  of the functions  $I_t$  and  $L_t$  given by Theorem 6.1. As  $\chi_t : \mathbb{A} \rightarrow U \subset T^*\Gamma$  is exact symplectic for each  $t \in J := [0, \delta(\kappa)]$  there exists a  $C^1$  family of functions  $\Psi_t \in C^\infty(\mathbb{A})$  such that

$$\chi_t^*(\xi dx) = Id\varphi + d\Psi_t.$$

Notice that the generating functions  $\phi_t$  of  $P_t^0$  are uniquely defined up to additive constants  $C_t$  such that the function  $J \ni t \rightarrow C_t$  is  $C^1$ .

**Lemma 6.4** *Choosing appropriately the  $C^1$  function  $J \ni t \rightarrow C_t$  we obtain the following*

(i) *We have*

$$\langle I, \nabla L_t(I) \rangle - L_t(I) = A_t(\chi_t(\varphi, I)) + \Psi_t(\varphi, I) - \Psi_t(P_t^0(\varphi, I)) + R_t^1(\varphi, I)$$

where the function  $R_t^1$  is flat at  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times E_t^\kappa$  for each  $t \in J$ ;

(ii)  $\beta_t(\omega) + L_t(I_t(\omega)) = \langle \omega, I_t(\omega) \rangle \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0, \quad t \in J.$

*Proof.* The Poincaré identity implies

$$P_t^*(\xi dx) = \xi dx + dA_t, \tag{6.60}$$

where  $\xi dx$  is the fundamental one-form on  $T^*\Gamma$  and  $A_t(\rho)$ ,  $\rho = \chi(\varphi, I) \in U$  is the action

$$A_t(\rho) = \int_{\tilde{\gamma}_t(\rho)} \xi dx$$

along the broken bicharacteristic  $\tilde{\gamma}_t(\rho)$  starting at  $\pi_t^+(\rho)$  and ending at  $\pi_t^-(P_t(\rho))$ . Then we obtain  $(P^0)^*(Id\varphi) - Id\varphi = d((A \circ \chi) + \Psi - \Psi \circ P^0)$ . On the other hand,  $(P^0)^*(Id\varphi) = d(L_t(I) - \langle I, \nabla L_t(I) \rangle + R_t^1(\varphi, I))$  where  $R_t^1$  is a flat function at  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times E_t^\kappa$  and we obtain (i). To prove (ii) we use (1.5).  $\square$

## 7 Microlocal Birkhoff Normal Form of the monodromy operator

Starting from the BNF in Theorem 6.1 we are going to find a microlocal (quantum) Birkhoff normal form (shortly QBNF) at the union of the invariant tori  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$ , of the corresponding microlocal monodromy operator for the family of Laplace-Beltrami operators  $\Delta_t$  in  $X$  with Dirichlet boundary conditions. A similar QBNF has been obtained in [56] for perturbations of the function in the Robin boundary conditions around a single Kronecker torus. In contrast to [56] the BNF of the tori here is nondegenerate which simplifies the construction.

Let us present the main steps in the construction. At first we reduce the problem to the boundary and introduce the corresponding microlocal monodromy operator  $M_t^0(\lambda)(\lambda)$ ,  $t \in J$ . The reduction to the boundary is obtained by a variant of the reflection method for the wave equation which consists in the following. Given a suitable function  $f(\cdot; \lambda)$  on  $\Gamma$  depending on a large parameter  $\lambda$  the frequency support of which is contained in a small neighborhood of the union of the invariant tori  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$ , we consider the corresponding outgoing solution of the reduced wave equation (the Helmholtz equation) in  $X$  and we reflect it at the boundary  $m - 1$  times if  $m \geq 2$ . After each reflection at the boundary we consider the corresponding branch of the solution  $u_t$  of the Helmholtz equation given by the outgoing parametrix. We denote by  $M_t(\lambda)f$  the restriction at  $\Gamma$  of the last branch of the solution  $u_t$ . We call  $M_t(\lambda)$  a monodromy operator. By construction, the function  $f(\cdot, \lambda)$  on  $\Gamma$  gives rise to an asymptotic solution  $u_t(\cdot, \lambda)$  of the Dirichlet problem of the Helmholtz equation

$$(-\Delta_t + \lambda^2)u_t = O_N(|\lambda|^{-N})f_t, \quad u_t|_\Gamma = O_N(|\lambda|^{-N})f_t,$$

or a quasi-mode  $(\lambda, u_t)$  of the Laplace-Beltrami operator with Dirichlet boundary conditions when  $\|u_t\|_{L^2} = 1$  if and only if

$$M_t^0(\lambda)(\lambda)f = f + O_N(|\lambda|^{-N})f.$$

The family of operators  $M_t^0(\lambda)(\lambda)$ ,  $t \in J$ , is a  $C^1$  family of Fourier Integral Operator with a large parameter  $\lambda$  ( $\lambda$ -FIO) the canonical relation of each of them being the graph of  $P_t$ . For this reason we recall in Sect. 7.1 some properties of the  $\lambda$ -FIOs associated with a  $C^1$  family of Lagrange immersions. The reduction to the boundary and the construction of the microlocal monodromy operator is done in Sect. 7.2.

Our next goal is to "separate the variables" microlocally near the whole family of invariant tori  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$ . This is done in Sect. 7.3. To this end we use the Birkhoff normal form of  $P_t$  given by Theorem 6.1. First we conjugate  $M_t^0(\lambda)$  with a microlocally unitary  $\lambda$ -FIO  $T_t(\lambda)$  the canonical relation of which is the graph of the symplectic transformation  $\chi_t$  given by Theorem 6.1. In this way we obtain a  $\lambda$ -FIO  $W_t(\lambda)$  the canonical relation of which is just the graph of  $P_t^0$  (see Proposition 7.11). Then we obtain a microlocal Birkhoff normal form  $W_t^0(\lambda)$  of  $W_t(\lambda)$  by conjugating it with a suitable  $\lambda$ -PDO and solving at any step the corresponding homological equation. In this way we separate microlocally the variables near the whole family of invariant tori. This means that the amplitude of  $W_t^0(\lambda)$  does not depend on the angular variables but only on the action variables at the family of invariant tori, which allows us to obtain a microlocal "spectral decomposition" of  $W_t(\lambda)$  near the family  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$ . At any step the corresponding phase functions and amplitudes are  $C^1$  with respect to the parameter  $t$ .

## 7.1 $C^1$ families of PDOs and FIOs with a large parameter $\lambda$ .

### 7.1.1 $C^1$ families of symbols and $\lambda$ -PDOs .

Let  $M^d$  be a smooth paracompact manifold of dimension  $d$ . We are going to define a class of  $C^1$  families of pseudo-differential operators depending on a large parameter  $\lambda$  (shortly  $\lambda$ -PDOs) acting on the half-density bundle  $\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}(M^d)$  of  $M^d$ . The large parameter  $\lambda$  will belong to the set

$$\mathcal{D} := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : |\operatorname{Re} \lambda| \geq C_0, |\operatorname{Im} \lambda| \leq C_1\}, \quad \sup_{\lambda \in \mathcal{D}} |\lambda| = +\infty, \quad (7.61)$$

where  $C_0, C_1 > 0$ . One can switch to the semi-classical setting by introducing  $\hbar := 1/\lambda$ .

Let us first define the symbols we are going to deal with. Given an interval  $J \subset \mathbb{R}$  we define a  $C^1$  family of symbols  $J \ni t \rightarrow a_t$  of order 0 in  $T^*\mathbb{R}^d$  as a map

$$J \times \mathcal{D} \longrightarrow C_0^\infty(T^*\mathbb{R}^d), \quad (t, \lambda) \longmapsto a_t(\cdot, \lambda),$$

such that

- The map  $J \ni t \rightarrow a_t(\cdot, \lambda) \in C^\infty(T^*\mathbb{R}^d)$  is  $C^1$  for any  $\lambda \in \mathcal{D}$  fixed;
- The support  $\operatorname{supp} a_t(\cdot, \lambda)$  is contained in a fixed compact subset of  $T^*\mathbb{R}^d$  independent of  $(t, \lambda) \in I \times \mathcal{D}$ ;
- For any  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^d$  there exists a positive constant  $C_{\alpha, \beta}$  such that

$$|\partial_t^k \partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta a_t(x, \xi, \lambda)| \leq C_{\alpha, \beta}$$

for every  $(t, \lambda) \in I \times \mathcal{D}$ ,  $(x, \xi) \in T^*\mathbb{R}^d$  and  $k \in \{0, 1\}$ .

In this case we say that  $a_t$  is a  $C^1$  family of symbols in  $S^0(T^*\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{D})$  with respect to the parameter  $t \in J$ . We set  $S^p(T^*\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{D}) = \lambda^p S^0(T^*\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{D})$  for  $p \in \mathbb{R}$  and denote by  $S^{-\infty}(T^*\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{D})$  the residual set  $\cap_{p \geq 0} S^{-p}(T^*\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{D})$ . We say that

$$J \ni t \longmapsto \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} a_{t,j} \lambda^{-j} \quad (7.62)$$

is a  $C^1$  family of formal symbols of order 0 if for any  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  the map  $J \ni t \mapsto a_{t,j} \in C^\infty(T^*\mathbb{R}^d)$  is  $C^1$  smooth and the support  $\text{supp } a_{t,j}$  is contained in a fixed compact subset of  $T^*\mathbb{R}^d$  independent of  $(t, j) \in I \times \mathbb{N}$ . A  $C^1$  family of symbols  $J \ni t \mapsto a_t \in S^0(T^*\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{D})$  is said to be a realization of the  $C^1$  family of formal symbols (7.62) if for any  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^d$  there exists a positive constant  $C_{N,\alpha,\beta}$  such that

$$\sup_{(t,x,\xi,\lambda) \in J \times T^*\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{D}} \left| \partial_t^k \partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta \left( a_t(x, \xi, \lambda) - \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} a_{t,j}(x, \xi) \lambda^{-j} \right) \right| \leq C_{N,\alpha,\beta} |\lambda|^{-N} \quad (7.63)$$

for  $k \in \{0, 1\}$ . Symbols admitting an asymptotic expansion of the form (7.63) for any  $N$  are said to be classical. We denote by  $S_{\text{cl}}^0(T^*\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{D})$  the class of the classical symbols. Any  $C^1$  family of formal symbols of order zero admits a  $C^1$  family of realizations by Borel's theorem.

**Proposition 7.1** *Any  $C^1$  family of formal symbols (7.62) of order 0 admits a realization as a  $C^1$  family of symbols  $J \ni t \mapsto a_t \in S^0(T^*\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{D})$ . Moreover, if  $a_t$  and  $a'_t$  are two  $C^1$  family of realizations of (7.62) then  $J \ni t \mapsto a_t - a'_t \in S^{-p}(T^*\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{D})$  is a  $C^1$  family for every  $p \geq 0$ .*

We give a prove of Borel's theorem in Appendix A.3.

We say that the family of operators  $J \ni t \mapsto \text{Op}(a_t)$  with Schwartz kernels

$$K_{\text{Op}(a_t)}(x, y, \lambda) := \left( \frac{\lambda}{2\pi} \right)^d \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i\lambda \langle x-y, \xi \rangle} a_t(x, \xi, \lambda) d\xi \right) |dx|^{\frac{1}{2}} |dy|^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (7.64)$$

is a  $C^1$  family of  $\lambda$ -PDOs of order zero acting on  $\frac{1}{2}$ -densities if  $J \ni t \mapsto a_t \in S^0(T^*\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{D})$  is a  $C^1$  family of symbols. We say that a family of operators  $J \ni t \mapsto A_t$  acting on the smooth sections of the half-density bundle  $\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}(M^d)$  of the manifold  $M^d$  is a  $C^1$  family of  $\lambda$ -PDOs if it is given by a  $C^1$  family of  $\lambda$ -PDOs with Schwartz kernels of the form (7.64) in any local coordinates.

### 7.1.2 $C^1$ families of $\lambda$ -FIOs.

Consider a  $C^1$  family of exact Lagrange immersions

$$\iota_t : \Lambda \rightarrow T^*M^d, \quad t \in [0, \delta], \quad (7.65)$$

which means that the map  $[0, \delta] \ni t \mapsto \iota_t \in C^\infty(\Lambda, T^*M^d)$  is  $C^1$ ,  $\iota_t$  is an immersion and the pull-back  $\iota_t^*(\xi dx)$  of the canonical one-form  $\xi dx$  of  $T^*M^d$  is exact for each  $t \in [0, \delta]$ . Then there exists a  $C^1$  mapping  $[0, \delta] \ni t \mapsto f_t \in C^\infty(\Lambda)$  such that

$$\iota_t^*(\xi dx) = df_t \quad t \in [0, \delta]. \quad (7.66)$$

Fix  $t \in [0, \delta]$ . Recall from [10] and [25] that a real valued phase function  $\Phi_t(x, \theta)$  defined in a neighborhood of a point  $(x^0, \theta^0) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^N$  with  $d_\theta \Phi_t(x^0, \theta^0) = 0$  is nondegenerate at  $(x^0, \theta^0)$  if

$$\text{rank } d_{(x,\theta)} d_\theta \Phi_t(x^0, \theta^0) = N. \quad (7.67)$$

Then there exists a neighborhood  $V \subset \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^N$  of  $(x^0, \theta^0)$  such that (7.67) holds for any  $(x, \theta) \in V$  and

$$C_{\Phi_t} := \{(x, \theta) \in V : d_\theta \Phi_t = 0\}$$

is a smooth manifold of dimension  $d$ . Moreover, the differential of the map

$$\iota_{\Phi_t} : C_{\Phi_t} \ni (x, \theta) \longrightarrow (x, d_x \Phi_t(x, \theta)) \in \Lambda_{\Phi_t} := \iota_{\Phi_t}(C_{\Phi_t}) \quad (7.68)$$

is of rank  $d$  and shrinking  $V$  if necessary we obtain that  $\Lambda_{\Phi_t}$  is an embedded Lagrangian submanifold of  $T^*M^d$ . We say that the nondegenerate function  $\Phi_t(x, \theta)$ ,  $(x, \theta) \in V$ , defines locally the Lagrange immersion  $\iota_t : \Lambda \rightarrow T^*M^d$  if there is an open subset  $W_t \subset \Lambda$  such that

$$\iota_t : W_t \rightarrow \Lambda_{\Phi_t} \quad \text{is a diffeomorphism.} \quad (7.69)$$

We can take  $\Phi_t = \Phi_t(x)$  depending only on the coordinates  $h$  ( $N = 0$ ) if the corresponding Lagrangian manifold is “horizontal” which means that the projection to the base is a local diffeomorphism. The collection  $(\iota_t^{-1}(\Lambda_{\Phi_t}), \iota_{\Phi_t}^{-1} \circ \iota_t)$  provides the Lagrangian immersion  $\iota_t : \Lambda \rightarrow T^*M^d$  with an atlas of local charts. Given an interval  $J \subset [0, \delta]$  we say that a  $C^1$  map  $J \ni t \rightarrow \Phi_t \in C^\infty(V, \mathbb{R})$  is a  $C^1$  family of nondegenerate phase functions generating locally the  $C^1$  family of Lagrange immersions (7.65) in  $J$  if for any  $t \in J$  the phase function  $\Phi_t$  is nondegenerate in  $V$  and (7.69) holds. Such  $C^1$  families of phase functions can always be constructed locally. Consider the function  $\Phi_t^\Lambda := (k_t \circ \iota_{\Phi_t}^{-1} \circ \iota_t)^*(\Phi_t)$  on  $\iota_t^{-1}(\Lambda_{\Phi_t})$  where  $k_t : C_{\Phi_t} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^N$  is the inclusion map. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} d\Phi_t^\Lambda &= (\iota_{\Phi_t}^{-1} \circ \iota_t)^* \left( k_t^* \left( \frac{\partial \Phi_t}{\partial x} dx + \frac{\partial \Phi_t}{\partial \theta} d\theta \right) \right) \\ &= \iota_t^* \left( (k_t \circ \iota_{\Phi_t}^{-1})^* \left( \frac{\partial \Phi_t}{\partial x} dx \right) \right) = \iota_t^*(\xi dx) = df_t \end{aligned}$$

and we choose  $\Phi_t$  so that  $\Phi_t^\Lambda = f_t$  on  $\iota_t^{-1}(\Lambda_{\Phi_t})$ , where  $f_t$  is defined in (7.66).

Given a  $C^1$  family of classical amplitudes  $[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow a_t \in S_{\text{cl}}^0(V \times \mathcal{D})$  such that  $a_t = 0$  for  $t \notin J$  we consider the  $C^1$  family of oscillatory  $\frac{1}{2}$ -densities

$$I_{\Phi_t, a_t}(x, \lambda) |dx|^{\frac{1}{2}} = \left( \frac{\lambda}{2\pi} \right)^{m + \frac{d+2N}{4}} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} e^{i\lambda \Phi_t(x, \theta)} a_t(x, \theta, \lambda) d\theta \right) |dx|^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (7.70)$$

with the convention that there is no integration when  $N = 0$ . Notice that the function  $[0, \delta] \ni t \mapsto I_{\Phi_t, a_t} \in C^\infty(M^d)$  is  $C^1$  for each  $\lambda \in \mathcal{D}$  fixed. Its oscillation is detected as  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$  by the corresponding semi-classical wave front set. Integrating by parts one obtains  $\text{WF}_\lambda(I_{\Phi_t, a_t}(\cdot, \lambda)) \subset \Lambda_{\Phi_t}$ , where  $\text{WF}_\lambda$  is the frequency set (or semi-classical  $\hbar$ -wave-front with  $\hbar = 1/\lambda$ ) (cf. [1], [8], [72], [19]). A (global)  $C^1$  family of oscillatory  $\frac{1}{2}$ -densities is given by

$$u_t(x, \lambda) = \sum_j I_{\Phi_t^j, a_t^j}(x, \lambda) |dx|^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (7.71)$$

where  $\Phi_t^j$  are nondegenerate phase functions in  $V_j \subset \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{N_j}$  such that  $\iota_t^{-1}(\Lambda_{\Phi_t^j})$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots$ , is a locally finite covering of  $\Lambda$  with open sets for each  $t$  fixed.

We denote the class of these oscillatory  $\frac{1}{2}$ -densities by  $I^m(M^d, \Lambda_t; \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}(M^d))$  or simply by  $I^m(M^d, \Lambda_t)$ . In order to simplify the notations we denote the immersion  $\iota_t : \Lambda \rightarrow T^*M^d$  by  $\Lambda_t$ .

To any oscillatory integral  $u_t(x, \lambda)$  of the form (7.70) one can associate a principal symbol

$$e^{i\lambda f_t} \sigma_t \quad \text{where} \quad \sigma_t = \left(\frac{\lambda}{2\pi}\right)^m \sigma_{1,t} \otimes \sigma_{2,t} \quad (7.72)$$

$t \rightarrow \sigma_{1,t}$  is a  $C^1$  family of sections of the half-density bundle  $\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Lambda)$  and  $\sigma_{2,t}$  is a section of the Keller-Maslov bundle  $M(\Lambda_t)$  for each  $t$  fixed (cf. [10, 40, 19]).

In any local chart the half-density part  $\sigma_{1,t}$  can be written in terms of the nondegenerate phase functions  $\Phi_t$  and the leading part  $a_{0,t}$  of the amplitude  $t$  in (7.70) as follows

$$(\iota_t^{-1} \circ \iota_{\Phi_t})^*(\sigma_{1,t}) = a_{t,0} |d_{C_{\Phi_t}}|^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (7.73)$$

(cf. [25], Sect. 25.3), where  $d_{C_{\Phi_t}}$  is a Leray form on  $C_{\Phi_t}$ , i.e.  $d_{C_{\Phi_t}} = k_t^*(\tilde{d}_{C_{\Phi_t}})$  is the pull-back via the inclusion map  $k_t : C_{\Phi_t} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^N$  of a form  $\tilde{d}_{C_{\Phi_t}}$  such that

$$\tilde{d}_{C_{\Phi_t}} \wedge d \frac{\partial \Phi_t}{\partial \theta_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge d \frac{\partial \Phi_t}{\partial \theta_N} = dx_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dx_d \wedge d\theta_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge d\theta_N.$$

Given for any  $t$  a suitable system of coordinates  $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_d)$  on  $C_{\Phi_t}$  extended to a neighborhood of  $C_{\Phi_t}$  one obtains

$$\begin{cases} d_{C_{\Phi_t}} = b_t d\mu_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge d\mu_d & \text{with} \\ b_t = \frac{dx_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dx_d \wedge d\theta_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge d\theta_N}{d\mu_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge d\mu_d \wedge d \frac{\partial \Phi_t}{\partial \theta_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge d \frac{\partial \Phi_t}{\partial \theta_N}} = \left| \frac{D(\mu, (\Phi_t)'_{\theta})}{D(x, \theta)} \right|^{-1}. \end{cases} \quad (7.74)$$

More generally, given a vector bundle  $E$  over  $M^d$ , we denote by  $I^m(M^d, \Lambda_t; \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}(M^d) \otimes E)$  the corresponding class of oscillatory  $\frac{1}{2}$ -densities of order  $m$  with values in the space of sections  $\Gamma(E)$ , and by  $S^m(\Lambda_t, \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Lambda) \otimes M(\Lambda_t) \otimes E_t)$  the corresponding class of symbols, where  $E_t$  is the lifting of  $E$  to  $\Lambda_t$ .

Given two manifolds  $M_j$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ , we denote by  $\omega_j$  the corresponding canonical symplectic forms on  $T^*(M_j)$  and consider the symplectic manifold  $T^*(M_2) \times T^*(M_1)$  equipped with the exact symplectic form  $\omega_2 - \omega_1$ . A  $C^1$  family of (exact) canonical relations  $\mathcal{C}_t$ ,  $t \in [0, \delta]$ , “from  $T^*(M_1)$  to  $T^*(M_2)$ ” is given by a  $C^1$  family of (exact) Lagrange immersions  $\iota_t : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow T^*(M_2) \times T^*(M_1)$ . To any  $C^1$  family of (exact) canonical relations  $\mathcal{C}_t$  one associates a  $C^1$  family of (exact) Lagrangian submanifolds  $\mathcal{C}'_t$  of  $T^*(M_2 \times M_1)$  defined by the exact Lagrange immersions  $\iota'_t : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow T^*(M_2 \times M_1)$  where  $\iota'_t = j \circ \iota_t$  and

$$j : T^*(M_2 \times M_1) \rightarrow T^*(M_2) \times T^*(M_1), \quad j(x_2, x_1, \xi_2, \xi_1) = (x_2, \xi_2, x_1, -\xi_1). \quad (7.75)$$

We use the same notations as in [25], Sect. 25, for the corresponding classes of  $\lambda$ -FIOs. Given vector bundles  $E_j$  on  $M_j$  and a  $C^1$  family of exact canonical relations  $\mathcal{C}_t$  from  $T^*(M_1)$  to  $T^*(M_2)$  we say that

$$A_t : C_0^\infty(M_1, \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}(M_1) \otimes E_1) \rightarrow C^\infty(M_2, \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}(M_2) \otimes E_2)$$

is a  $C^1$  family of  $\lambda$ -FIOs of order  $m$  if the family of the corresponding Schwartz kernels  $K_{A_t}$  is a  $C^1$  family of oscillatory  $\frac{1}{2}$ -densities belonging to  $I^m(M_2 \times M_1, \mathcal{C}_t; \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}(M_2 \times M_1) \otimes \text{Hom}(E_1, E_2))$ . The composition of  $\lambda$ -FIOs with exact canonical relations having transversal and more generally

a clean composition can be defined in the same way as in the case of classical FIOs [19, 40]. The microlocal calculus is even simpler since the amplitudes are uniformly compactly supported with respect to  $\theta$ . In particular we have the following analogue of Theorem 25.2.4 [25] (see [10], [19])

**Theorem 7.2** *Let  $P_t$  be a  $C^1$  family of classical  $\lambda$ -PDOs of order 0 acting on  $\frac{1}{2}$ -densities in  $M_2$  with principal symbol  $p_t$  and subprincipal symbol  $c_t$ . Let  $\mathcal{C}_t$  be a  $C^1$  family of exact canonical relations from  $T^*(M_1)$  to  $T^*(M_2)$  with Schwartz kernels  $K_{A_t} \in I^k(M_2 \times M_1, \mathcal{C}_t'; \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}(M_2 \times M_1))$  with principal symbols  $e^{i\lambda f_t} \sigma_t$ . Suppose that  $p_t$  vanishes on the projection of  $\mathcal{C}_t'$  to  $X_2$ . Then  $P_t A_t$  is a  $C^1$  family of  $\lambda$ -FIOs of order  $k-1$  with kernels  $K_{P_t A_t}$  in  $I^{k-1}(M_2 \times M_1, \mathcal{C}_t'; \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}(M_2 \times M_1))$  and principal symbols*

$$e^{i\lambda f_t} \left( i^{-1} \mathcal{L}_{X_{p_t}} \sigma_t + c_t \sigma_t \right)$$

where  $X_{p_t}$  is the Hamiltonian vector field of  $p_t$  lifted to functions in  $T^*(M_2 \times M_1)$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{X_{p_t}}$  is the Lie derivative.

### 7.1.3 Quantization of $C^1$ families of billiard ball maps.

The aim of this section is to construct a family of monodromy operators quantizing billiard ball maps of a  $C^1$  family of billiard tables. The monodromy operators will arise as boundary values of the microlocal outgoing parametrizes  $H_t(\lambda) : L^2(\Gamma) \rightarrow C^\infty(\tilde{X})$ ,  $t \in [0, \delta]$ , of the Dirichlet problem for the Helmholtz equation. We will construct  $H_t(\lambda)$  for  $t \in [0, \delta]$  as a  $C^1$  family of  $\lambda$ -FIOs satisfying asymptotically the Helmholtz equation at high frequencies ( $|\lambda| \rightarrow \infty$ ), i.e.

$$\forall N \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (\Delta_t - \lambda^2) H_t(\lambda) u = O_N(|\lambda|^{-N}) u \quad (7.76)$$

in a neighborhood of  $X$  in a smooth extension  $(\tilde{X}, g_t)$  of the Riemannian manifold of  $(X, g_t)$ . Hereafter,

$$O_N(|\lambda|^{-N}) : L^2(\Gamma) \rightarrow L^2(\tilde{X})$$

stands for a  $C^1$  family with respect to  $t$  of operators  $A_t(\lambda) : L^2(\Gamma) \rightarrow L^2(\tilde{X})$  depending on  $\lambda \in \mathcal{D}$  such that

$$\|A_t(\lambda)\|_{L^2} \leq C_N(1 + |\lambda|)^{-N}$$

for each  $t$  and  $\lambda \in \mathcal{D}$  where  $C_N > 0$  is a constant independent of  $t$  and of  $\lambda$ . Moreover,  $u$  are suitable “initial data” on  $\Gamma$ . Set

$$\Lambda := \{(s, \rho) \in \mathbb{R} \times T^*\Gamma : \rho \in U, -\varepsilon < s < T_0(\rho) + 2\varepsilon\}, \quad (7.77)$$

where  $U$  is a compact subset of the domain of definition  $\tilde{B}_0^*\Gamma$  of the billiard ball map  $B_0$ ,  $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ , and  $T_t : U \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$  is the “return time function” which assigns to each  $\rho \in U$  the time of the first impact at the boundary, i.e. the smallest positive  $s = T_t(\rho)$  such that  $\exp(sX_{h_t})(\pi_t^+(\rho)) \in \Sigma_t^-$ . Recall from Sect. 2.1 that  $h_t$  is the Hamiltonian corresponding to the Riemannian metric  $g_t$  via the Legendre transform,  $X_{h_t}$  is the corresponding Hamiltonian vector field, and the map  $\pi_t^+ : B^*\Gamma \rightarrow \Sigma_t^+$  is defined by (2.13). In particular,  $\exp(sX_{h_t})(\pi_t^+(\rho))$  lies on the cosphere bundle

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_t := S_t^* \tilde{X} = \{(x, \xi) \in T^* \tilde{X} : h_t(x, \xi) = 1\}. \quad (7.78)$$

The FIOs  $H_t(\lambda)$ ,  $t \in [0, \delta]$ , will be associated to the  $C^1$  family of canonical relations  $\mathcal{C}_t$  in  $T^*\tilde{X} \times T^*\Gamma$  given by the  $C^1$  family of immersions

$$\iota_t : \Lambda \rightarrow T^*\tilde{X} \times T^*\Gamma, \quad \iota_t(s, \rho) = (\exp(sX_{h_t})(\pi_t^+(\rho)), \rho). \quad (7.79)$$

Choosing  $\delta > 0$  sufficiently small we suppose that the set  $U$  in (7.77) is a connected open subset of  $T^*\Gamma$  such that

- $U$  is contained in  $\tilde{B}_t^*\Gamma$  for any  $t \in [0, \delta]$ ;
- $T_t(\rho) < T_0(\rho) + \varepsilon$  for any  $t \in [0, \delta]$  and  $\rho \in \bar{U}$ .

Then  $T_t$  is a smooth function on  $\bar{U}$ , its image is a compact interval and there exist  $0 < a < b$  such that  $T_t(U) \subset [a, b]$  for any  $t$ . Moreover, Lemma A.1. in [56] implies that

$$\iota'_t = j \circ \iota_t : \Lambda \rightarrow T^*(\tilde{X} \times \Gamma).$$

is a  $C^1$  family of exact Lagrangian immersions which will be denoted by  $\mathcal{C}'_t$ ,  $t \in [0, \delta]$ . We choose the corresponding function  $f_t$  in (7.66) to be just the action  $f_t(s, \rho) = 2s$  on the bicharacteristic arc associated with  $\iota_t(s, \rho) \in \mathcal{C}_t$ , where  $(s, \rho) \in \Lambda \subset \mathbb{R} \times T^*\Gamma$ .

Our aim now is to define the immersed Lagrangian manifold  $\mathcal{C}'_t$  locally by a nondegenerate phase function. Fix  $t^0 \in [0, \delta]$  and take  $\varrho^0 = (x^0, y^0, \xi^0, -\eta^0) \in \mathcal{C}'_{t^0}$ . Choose a smooth submanifold  $M^0$  of  $\tilde{X}$  of dimension  $n-1$  passing through  $x^0$  and transversal at  $x^0$  to the geodesic of  $g_{t^0}$  starting from  $y^0$  with codirection  $(\eta^0)^+$ . Consider the symplectic map  $\chi_t : U^0 \rightarrow T^*M^0$  defined in a neighborhood  $U^0$  of  $\rho^0 = (y^0, \eta^0)$  in  $\tilde{B}_t^*\Gamma$  by

$$\chi_t(\rho) = (\pi \circ \exp(s(\rho)X_{h_t}) \circ \pi_t^+)(\rho), \quad \rho \in U^0 \subset \tilde{B}_t^*\Gamma,$$

where  $s(\rho) > 0$  is the arrival time at  $T^*X|_{M^0}$  and  $\pi(x', x_n, \xi', \xi_n) = (x', \xi')$ . If  $M^0 = \Gamma$ , this is just the billiard ball map  $B_t$  defined in Sect. 2.1. Denote by  $\mathcal{C}'_{\chi_t} \subset T^*(M \times \Gamma)$  the Lagrangian manifold corresponding to the canonical relation  $\mathcal{C}_{\chi_t} := \{(\chi_t(\rho), \rho) : \rho \in U^0\}$ .

Let  $J \ni t \rightarrow x_t = (x'_t, x_{t,n}) \in C^\infty(\mathcal{O}, \mathbb{R}^n)$  be a  $C^1$  family of normal coordinates to  $M^0$  with respect to the metrics  $g_t$ , where  $J \subset [0, \delta]$  is an interval containing  $t^0$  and  $\mathcal{O}$  is a sufficiently small neighborhood of  $x^0$ . For any fixed  $t \in J$  we have  $M^0 \cap \mathcal{O} = \{x_n = 0\} \cap \mathcal{O}$  and the normal vector field to  $M^0 \cap \mathcal{O}$  associated to  $g_t$  and determined by  $\xi^0(\nu_t(x^0)) > 0$  becomes  $\nu_t = (0, \dots, 0, 1)$  in these coordinates. Then the Hamiltonian  $h_t$  is of the form

$$h_t(x, \xi) = \xi_n^2 + r_t(x, \xi') \quad (7.80)$$

in these coordinates, where  $J \ni t \rightarrow r_t$  is a  $C^1$  family of smooth functions in a neighborhood of  $(x^0, \xi^0)$ . If  $x^0 \in \Gamma$ , we take  $M^0$  to be a neighborhood of  $x^0$  in  $\Gamma$ , then  $r_t(x', 0, \xi') = h_t^0(x', \xi')$  is the Hamiltonian corresponding to the induced Riemannian metric  $g_t^0$  on  $\Gamma$ .

Following the proof of Hörmander [25], Proposition 25.3.3, we can find local coordinates  $y \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  in a neighborhood of  $y^0$  in  $\Gamma$  such that projection  $\mathcal{C}'_{\chi_{t^0}} \ni (x', \xi', y, \eta) \rightarrow (x', \eta) \in T^*\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  is a local diffeomorphism in a neighborhood of  $(x^0, \xi^0, y^0, \eta^0)$ . Shrinking  $J$  if necessary we obtain that the map  $\mathcal{C}'_{\chi_t} \ni (x', \xi', y, \eta) \rightarrow (x', \eta) \in T^*\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  is a local diffeomorphism as well for any  $t \in J$ . Then there exists a  $C^1$  family of smooth functions  $\phi_t^0$  defined in a neighborhood  $V^0$  of  $(x^0, \eta^0)$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  such that

$$\det \frac{\partial^2 \phi_t^0}{\partial x' \partial \eta}(x', \eta) \neq 0 \quad \text{for } (x', \eta) \in V^0. \quad (7.81)$$

and

$$\text{graph}(\chi_t) = \{(x', (\phi_t^0)'_{x'}(x', \eta); (\phi_t^0)'_{\eta}(x', \eta), \eta); (x', \eta) \in V^0\} \quad (7.82)$$

(see [25], Theorem 22.2.18). Then solving a suitable Hamilton-Jacobi equation we obtain a  $C^1$  family of nondegenerate phase functions

$$\Phi_t(x, y, \eta) = \phi_t(x, \eta) - \langle y, \eta \rangle \quad (7.83)$$

in a neighborhood of  $(x^0, y^0, \eta^0)$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  generating locally  $C'_t$  in a neighborhood  $C'_{\Phi_t}$  of  $\varrho_0$  where  $\phi_t(x^0, \eta) = \phi_t^0(x', \eta)$ . In particular, we have

$$\det \frac{\partial^2 \phi_t}{\partial x' \partial \eta}(x, \eta) \neq 0 \quad \text{in a neighborhood } V \text{ of } (x^0, \eta^0). \quad (7.84)$$

We summarize this construction as follows.

**Lemma 7.3** *There exists an open interval  $J \subset [0, \delta]$  containing  $t^0$ , local coordinates  $y \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  in a neighborhood of  $y^0$  in  $\Gamma$  and independent of  $t$ , a neighborhood  $V^0 \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  of  $(x^0, \eta^0)$  and a  $C^1$  family of function  $\phi_t^0 \in C^\infty(V^0)$  satisfying (7.81) and such that the following holds*

1. *the function  $\Phi_t^0(x', y, \eta) := \phi_t^0(x', \eta) - \langle y, \eta \rangle$  is a local generating function of the Lagrangian manifold  $C'_{\chi_t} \subset T^*(M^0 \times \Gamma)$  for every  $t \in J$ ;*
2. *the Lagrangian manifold  $C'_t$  is defined in a neighborhood of  $\varrho_0$  by a phase function*

$$\Phi_t(x, y, \eta) = \phi_t(x, \eta) - \langle y, \eta \rangle,$$

where  $\phi_t(x, \eta)$  is a local solution of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$\partial_{x_n} \phi_t(x, \eta) = \sqrt{1 - r_t(x, \partial_{x'} \phi_t(x, \eta))}, \quad \phi_t(x', 0, \eta) = \phi_t^0(x', \eta), \quad (7.85)$$

and  $r_t$  is given by (7.80).

3. *there exists a neighborhood  $V \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  of  $(x^0, \eta^0)$  such that the family of functions  $J \ni t \rightarrow \phi_t \in C^\infty(V, \mathbb{R})$  is  $C^1$  and (7.84) holds for any  $t \in J$ .*

In particular,

$$\Phi_t(x, y, \eta) = \phi_t^0(x', \eta) - \langle y, \eta \rangle + x_n \phi_t^1(x, \eta), \quad (7.86)$$

where  $J \ni t \rightarrow \phi_t^1 \in C^\infty(V, \mathbb{R})$  is a  $C^1$  map. We take  $\phi_t^0(x', \eta) = \langle x', \eta \rangle$  if the image of  $\varrho_0$  by the involution in (7.75) belongs to  $\Sigma_{t^0}^+ \times U$ , which means that  $x^0 = (y^0, 0)$  and  $\xi^0 = (\eta^0)^+$ .

In order to obtain the Maslov part of the principal symbol picked up by the phase functions constructed by the Lemma we need the following. Fix  $\tilde{t}^0 \in [0, \delta]$ , take  $\tilde{\varrho}^0 = (\tilde{x}^0, \tilde{y}^0, \tilde{\xi}^0, -\tilde{\eta}^0) \in C'_{\tilde{t}^0}$  and denote by  $\tilde{M}^0$  the corresponding submanifold transversal at  $\tilde{x}^0$  to the geodesic of  $g_{\tilde{t}^0}$  starting from  $\tilde{y}^0$  with codirection  $(\tilde{\eta}^0)^+$  and by  $\tilde{\chi}_t : \tilde{U}^0 \rightarrow T^*\tilde{M}^0$  the corresponding symplectic map. Let  $\tilde{J}$  be the corresponding interval about  $\tilde{t}^0$  and  $\tilde{\Phi}_t(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{\eta}) = \phi_t(\tilde{x}, \tilde{\eta}) - \langle \tilde{y}, \tilde{\eta} \rangle$ ,  $t \in \tilde{J}$ , the corresponding  $C^1$  family of phase functions given by Lemma 7.3. Suppose that  $\tau \in J \cap \tilde{J} \neq \emptyset$  and that there exists  $\zeta \in \Lambda$  such that

$$\iota'_\tau(\zeta) \in C'_{\Phi_t} \cap C'_{\tilde{\Phi}_t}.$$

**Lemma 7.4** *There exists a neighborhood  $I \subset J \cap \tilde{J}$  of  $\tau$  and a neighborhood  $V$  of  $\zeta$  in  $\Lambda$  such that the function  $\mu : V \times I \rightarrow 2\mathbb{Z}$  defined by*

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(\varrho, t) &:= \operatorname{sgn}(\phi_t)''_{\eta\eta}(x, \eta) - \operatorname{sgn}(\tilde{\phi}_t)''_{\tilde{\eta}\tilde{\eta}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{\eta}), \\ \iota_t(\rho) &= \iota_{\Phi_t}(x, (\phi_t)'_{\eta}(x, \eta), \eta) = \iota_{\tilde{\Phi}_t}(\tilde{x}, (\tilde{\phi}_t)'_{\tilde{\eta}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{\eta}), \tilde{\eta}).\end{aligned}$$

*is constant on  $V \times I$ .*

*Proof.* The assertion follows from an argument in [11] using Hörmander's index  $\sigma(M_1, M_2; L_1, L_2) \in \mathbb{Z}$  of four Lagrangian spaces  $M_1, M_2, L_1, L_2$  in the Lagrangian Grassmannian  $\Lambda(n-1)$ , where  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  are transversal to both  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  in  $T^*\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  (see [10], Definition 3.4.2). It is known that  $\sigma$  is locally constant and continuous with respect to all the variables  $(M_1, M_2, L_1, L_2)$ . Set  $\iota_\tau(\zeta) = (u, (\phi_\tau)'_u(u, v), (\phi_\tau)'_v(u, v), v) \in T^*\tilde{X} \times T^*\Gamma$  where  $\phi_t, t \in J$ , is the phase function in Lemma 7.3 corresponding to the coordinates  $x_t : \mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ . Take a section  $M$  in  $\tilde{X}$  passing through the point  $u$  and transversal to the geodesic starting from  $\partial_v \phi_\tau(u, v) \in \Gamma$  and having a codirection  $v^+$ . We can suppose that  $M = \{x_n = g(x')\}$  in these coordinates with some smooth function  $g$ . Let us change the  $x$  coordinates in a neighborhood of  $M$  by  $z' = x'$  and  $z_n = x_n - g(x')$  and set  $\psi_t(z, \eta) = \phi_t(z', z_n + g(z'), \eta)$ . Consider the (local) symplectic transformation  $\chi_t^0 : T^*\Gamma \rightarrow T^*M$  defined by

$$\chi_t^0(\rho) = (\pi^0 \circ \exp(s_t^0(\rho)X_{h_t}) \circ \pi_t^+)(\rho), \quad \rho \in U_0 \subset \tilde{B}_t^*\Gamma,$$

for  $t$  sufficiently close to  $\tau$ , where  $s_t^0(\rho) > 0$  is the arrival time at  $T^*X|_M$  and  $\pi^0(z', z_n, \xi', \xi_n) = (z', \xi')$ . Then  $(z', \eta) \rightarrow \psi_t(z', 0, \eta)$  is a generating function of  $\chi_t^0$  in the sense of (7.82). Given  $(x, y, \eta) \in C_{\Phi_t}$  in a neighborhood of  $(u, \partial_u \phi_\tau(v), v)$  with  $x \in M$ , we obtain as in [11] p. 69

$$\operatorname{sgn}(\Phi_t)''_{\eta\eta}(x', g(x'), y, \eta) = \operatorname{sgn}(\psi_t)''_{\eta\eta}(z', 0, \eta) = \operatorname{sgn}(V, H_t; (d\chi_t^0)^{-1}(V))$$

where  $\operatorname{sgn}(M_1, M_2; L)$  is defined in [10], Definition 3.4.3,  $V = \{(\delta z', \delta \xi') : \delta z' = 0\}$  is the vertical space (the tangent space to the fiber) and  $H_t$  is the horizontal space  $\{(\delta z', \delta \xi') : \delta \xi' = 0\}$  for the local coordinates  $x_t$  in  $\mathcal{O}$  used in the construction of  $\Phi_t$ . Repeating this procedure in  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$  for the phase function  $\tilde{\Phi}_t$  obtained by Lemma 7.3 corresponding to the coordinates  $\tilde{x}_t : \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}& \operatorname{sgn}(\Phi_t)''_{\eta\eta}(x, y, \eta) - \operatorname{sgn}(\tilde{\Phi}_t)''_{\tilde{\eta}\tilde{\eta}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{\eta}) \\ &= \operatorname{sgn}(V, H_t; (d\chi_t^0)^{-1}(V)) - \operatorname{sgn}(V, \tilde{H}_t; (d\tilde{\chi}_t^0)^{-1}(V)) = 2\sigma(H_t, \tilde{H}_t; (d\chi_t^0)^{-1}(V), V)\end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{H}_t$  is the horizontal space  $\{(\delta z', \delta \xi') : \delta \xi' = 0\}$  for the corresponding local coordinates  $\tilde{x}_t : \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  used in the construction of  $\tilde{\Phi}_t$ . This shows that  $\mu$  is independent of  $t$  and of  $\varrho$  in a small neighborhood of  $(\tau, \zeta)$ .  $\square$

Using the phase functions obtained in Lemma 7.3 one can define the space of  $\lambda$ -FIOs corresponding to the  $C^1$  family of canonical relations  $\mathcal{C}_t$ . We are looking for solutions  $H_t(\lambda)$  of (7.76) with Schwartz kernels in  $I^{-1/4}(\tilde{X} \times \Gamma, \mathcal{C}'_t)$ . To any  $C^1$  family of nondegenerate phase function  $\Phi_t(x, y, \eta)$  of the form (7.83) generating  $\mathcal{C}'_t$  in a neighborhood of a point  $\varrho_0 = (x^0, y^0, \xi^0, -\eta^0) \in \mathcal{C}'$  ( $\Phi_t$  is given by Lemma 7.3) there is a  $C^1$  family of classical amplitudes

$$b_t(x, \eta, \lambda) \sim b_{0,t}(x, \eta) + b_{1,t}(x, \eta)\lambda^{-1} + \dots$$

such that the Schwartz kernel of  $H_t(\lambda)$  can be written microlocally near  $\varrho_0$  as a  $C^1$  family of oscillatory  $\frac{1}{2}$ -densities

$$I_{\Phi_t}(x, y, \lambda) = \left(\frac{\lambda}{2\pi}\right)^{n-1} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} e^{i\lambda\Phi_t(x, y, \eta)} b_t(x, \eta, \lambda) d\eta \right) |dx|^{1/2} |dy|^{1/2}. \quad (7.87)$$

(see (7.70)).

Notice that the Hamiltonian  $p_t$  in  $T^*(X \times \Gamma)$  obtained by lifting of the principal symbol  $h_t - 1$  of the operator  $\lambda^{-2}\Delta_t - 1$  vanishes on  $\mathcal{C}'_t$ . Thus to compute the principal symbol of  $(\Delta_t - \lambda^2)H_t(\lambda)$  we can use Theorem 7.2. Note also that the corresponding subprincipal symbol is  $c_t = 0$ .

We are going to define suitable sections  $\sigma_{1,t}$  and  $\sigma_{2,t}$  of the half density bundle and of the Keller-Maslov bundle of  $\mathcal{C}'_t$ . The lifting of the Hamiltonian vector field  $X_{h_t}$  to  $T^*X \times T^*\Gamma$  is  $Y_t = (X_{h_t}, 0)$  and its flow  $S_t^\tau$  restricted to  $\mathcal{C}_t$  is given by

$$S_t^\tau(x, \xi, y, \eta) = S_t^\tau(\exp(sX_h)(\pi_\Sigma^+(y, \eta)), y, \eta) = (\exp((s + \tau)X_{h_t})(\pi_t^+(y, \eta)), y, \eta) \quad (7.88)$$

for any  $(x, \xi, y, \eta) \in \mathcal{C}_t$ . The volume form  $\beta_t$  on  $\mathcal{C}_t$  given by the pull-back by  $\iota_t$  of

$$ds \wedge (dy_1 \wedge d\eta_1) \wedge \cdots \wedge (dy_{n-1} \wedge d\eta_{n-1}) \in \Omega(\Lambda)$$

is invariant with respect to the flow  $S_t^\tau$  or equivalently, the Lie derivative  $\mathcal{L}_{Y_t}\beta_0$  vanishes. Then the Lie derivative of the  $\frac{1}{2}$ -density  $\sigma_{0,t} := |j^*(\beta_0)|^{\frac{1}{2}} \in |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathcal{C}'_t)$  with respect to  $X_{p_t}$  is zero. Recall that  $j$  is given by (7.75) and that  $X_{p_t}$  is the Hamiltonian vector field of  $h_t - 1$  lifted to functions in  $T^*(\tilde{X} \times \Gamma)$ . We set

$$\sigma_{1,t} = \tilde{b}_{0,t}\sigma_{0,t}, \quad \tilde{b}_{0,t} \in C_0^\infty(\mathcal{C}'_t). \quad (7.89)$$

The relation between  $\tilde{b}_{0,t}$  and the principal part  $b_{0,t}$  of the amplitude  $b_t$  in (7.87) is obtained in [56], (A.23). More precisely, let us denote by  $\eta_t = \eta_t(x, \xi')$  the local solution of  $\xi' = (\phi_t)'_{x'}(x, \eta)$  obtained by the implicit function theorem and set

$$\tilde{b}'_{0,t}(x, \xi') = \tilde{b}_{0,t}(\pi_1^{-1}(x, \xi', \xi_n)),$$

where  $\pi_1 : \mathcal{C}'_t \rightarrow \tilde{\Sigma}_t \subset T^*\tilde{X}$  is the projection  $\pi_1(x, y, \xi, -\eta) = (x, \xi)$ . Then [56], (A.23), yields

$$b_{0,t}(x, \eta_t(x, \xi')) = \frac{\tilde{b}'_{0,t}(x, \xi')}{\sqrt{2|\xi_n|}} |\det(\phi_t)''_{x'\eta}(x, \eta(x, \xi'))|^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (7.90)$$

in a neighborhood of  $(x^0, \xi^0)$ , where  $\xi_n = \sqrt{1 - r_t(x, \xi')}$ .

The Keller-Maslov bundle  $M(\mathcal{C}'_t)$  of  $\mathcal{C}'_t$  admits a natural trivialization by locally constant sections. Recall from Hörmander [24], p. 148, that a section of the line bundle  $M(\mathcal{C}'_t)$  is given by a family of functions  $f_{\Phi_t} : \mathcal{C}'_{\Phi_t} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ , where  $\Phi_t$  is a nondegenerate phase function generating locally  $\mathcal{C}'_t$  at  $\mathcal{C}'_{\Phi_t} = \iota_{\Phi_t}(C_{\Phi_t})$  (see (7.68)) such that  $f_{\tilde{\Phi}_t} = i^{\mu_t} f_{\Phi_t}$  on  $\mathcal{C}'_{\tilde{\Phi}_t} \cap \mathcal{C}'_{\Phi_t}$ . The function  $\mu_t = \mu_{\tilde{\Phi}_t\Phi_t}$  is defined by

$$\mu_{\tilde{\Phi}_t\Phi_t}(\varrho) := \frac{1}{2} \left( (\operatorname{sgn}(\Phi_t)''_{\theta\theta}(x, y, \theta) - N) - (\operatorname{sgn}(\tilde{\Phi}_t)''_{\theta\theta}(x, y, \theta) - \tilde{N}) \right), \quad (7.91)$$

where  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^N$ ,  $\tilde{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{N}}$ ,  $(\Phi_t)'_{\theta}(x, y, \theta) = 0$ ,  $(\tilde{\Phi}_t)'_{\tilde{\theta}}(x, y, \tilde{\theta}) = 0$  and  $\varrho = \iota_{\Phi_t}(x, y, \theta) = \iota_{\tilde{\Phi}_t}(x, y, \tilde{\theta}) \in \mathcal{C}'_{\tilde{\Phi}_t} \cap \mathcal{C}'_{\Phi_t}$ . Moreover,  $\mu_{\tilde{\Phi}_t \Phi_t} \in \mathbb{Z}$  and it is constant on each connected component of  $\mathcal{C}'_{\tilde{\Phi}_t} \cap \mathcal{C}'_{\Phi_t}$ . The section will be called “natural” if  $f_{\Phi_t}$  are constant functions taking values in  $\{i^k : k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ . In our case  $M(\mathcal{C}'_t)$  can be trivialized in a band  $|s| < \epsilon$  using the phase functions  $\Phi_t$  given by Lemma 7.3, where  $\phi_t^0(x', \eta) = \langle x', \eta \rangle$ . Then  $(\Phi_t)''_{\eta\eta}(y, 0, y, \eta) = 0$  in view (7.86) and we get  $\text{sgn}(\Phi_t)''_{\eta\eta}(y, 0, y, \eta) = 0$ . This yields a natural trivialization of the Keller-Maslov bundle in a band  $\mathcal{C}' \cap \{|s| < \epsilon\}$  for some  $\epsilon > 0$ , choosing a locally constant section which equals 1 in that band. In particular, the Lie derivative  $\mathcal{L}_{Y_t} \sigma_{2,t}$  vanishes for each  $t$ . This argument holds whenever  $\mathcal{C}'|_{s=0}$  is a conormal bundle of a smooth submanifold (see [24] Sect. 3.3 and [11], p. 65).

Using Lemma 7.4 one can obtain a natural section  $\sigma_{2,t}$  of  $M(\mathcal{C}'_t)$  which is independent of  $t$  in a small neighborhood of  $t^0$  for any  $t^0 \in [0, \delta]$ . The section  $\sigma_{2,t}$  of  $M(\mathcal{C}'_t)$  can be described as in [11], [24] and [40] as a Maslov index of a suitable path. Let  $\varrho_1 = (x^0, y^0, \xi^0, -\eta^0) \in \mathcal{C}'_{t^0}$  and  $(x^0, \xi^0) = \exp(TX_{h_{t^0}})(y^0, \eta^0)$ . Let  $M$  be a submanifold transversal to the corresponding geodesic in  $x^0$  and let  $\Phi_t$  be a  $C^1$  family of generating function of  $\mathcal{C}'_t$  in a neighborhood of  $\varrho_1$  given by Lemma 7.3. Consider the path  $\tilde{\gamma}_t$  on  $\mathcal{C}'_t$  defined by

$$\pi_1(\tilde{\gamma}_t(s)) = \exp(sX_{h_t})(\pi_t^+(y^0, \eta^0)), \quad s \in [0, T].$$

We have

$$\tilde{\gamma}_{t^0}(0) := \varrho_0 = (y^0, y^0, (\eta^0)^+, -\eta^0) \in \mathcal{C}'_{t^0}|_{s=0} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\gamma}(T) = \varrho_1 \in \mathcal{C}'_{t^0}.$$

Choose a partition  $0 = s_0 < s_1 < \dots < s_k = T$  and phase functions  $\Phi_{t,j}$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, k$ , as in Lemma 7.3 generating locally  $\mathcal{C}'_t$  in a neighborhood of  $\tilde{\gamma}_t(s_j)$  for  $t$  in a small neighborhood of  $t^0$  and such that

$$\tilde{\gamma}_t([s_{j-1}, s_j]) \subset \mathcal{C}'_{\Phi_{t,j}}, \quad \Phi_{t,k} = \Phi_t \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_{t,1}(x', 0, y, \eta) = \langle x' - y, \eta \rangle.$$

Then trivializing  $M(\mathcal{C}'_t)$  in a neighborhood of  $\varrho_1$  by the phase function  $\Phi_t$  we get

$$(\sigma_{2t})_{\Phi_t} = i^{\mu(\tilde{\gamma}_t)}, \quad \text{where}$$

$$\mu(\tilde{\gamma}_t) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \left( \text{sgn}(\Phi_{t,j})''_{\eta\eta}(\tilde{\gamma}_t(s_j)) - \text{sgn}(\Phi_{t,j+1})''_{\eta\eta}(\tilde{\gamma}_t(s_j)) \right) \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (7.92)$$

Now Lemma 7.4 implies that  $\mu(\tilde{\gamma}_t)$  is independent of  $t \in I$  where  $I$  is a sufficiently small neighborhood of  $t^0$  in  $[0, \delta]$ . In other to construct  $\sigma_{2,t}$  one can use finitely many paths  $\tilde{\gamma}_t$  since  $\mathcal{C}'_{t^0}$  is compact, hence  $I$  can be chosen to be common for all the paths. We set

$$\sigma_t = \sigma_{1,t} \times \sigma_{2,t} = \tilde{b}_{0,t} \sigma_{0,t} \times \sigma_{2,t}.$$

According to Theorem 7.2 the oscillatory integral  $(\Delta_t - \lambda^2)K_{H_t}(x, y, \lambda)$  belongs to  $I^{3/4}(\tilde{X} \times \Gamma, \mathcal{C}'_t)$  and its principal symbol is just the Lie derivative  $\mathcal{L}_{Y_t} \sigma_t$  multiplied by  $(\lambda/2\pi)^{3/4}$  since the subprincipal symbol of the Laplace-Beltrami operator is 0. Moreover, the Lie derivative with respect to  $Y$  of the sections  $\sigma_{0,t}$  and  $\sigma_{2,t}$  vanishes, hence, the transport equation  $\mathcal{L}_{Y_t} \sigma_t = 0$  becomes

$$(S^t)^* \tilde{b}_{0,t} = \tilde{b}_{0,t}. \quad (7.93)$$

Multiplying  $\tilde{b}_0$  with a suitable cut-off function, which equals 1 in a neighborhood of  $\mathcal{C}'_t \cap T^*(X \times \Gamma)$ , we can suppose that  $\tilde{b}_0$  has a compact support with respect to  $(s, y, \eta) \in \Lambda$ . In this way we

obtain a  $C^1$  family of  $\lambda$ -FIOs  $H_{0,t}(\lambda)$  with Schwartz kernels in  $I^{-1/4}(\tilde{X} \times \Gamma, \mathcal{C}'_t)$  such that the Schwartz kernel of  $(\Delta_t - \lambda^2)H_{0,t}(\lambda)$  belongs to  $I^{-1/4}(X \times \Gamma, \mathcal{C}'_t)$ . Repeating this procedure we get an operator  $H_{1,t}(\lambda)$  such that  $H_0(\lambda) + H_1(\lambda)$  solves (7.76) modulo a  $\lambda$ -FIO of order  $-5/4$  and so on. The initial data  $\tilde{b}_0|_{s=0}$  will be determined by Lemma 7.5 below.

Denote by  $\iota_\Gamma^* : C^\infty(\tilde{X}) \rightarrow C^\infty(\Gamma)$  the operator of restriction  $\iota_\Gamma^*(u) = u|_\Gamma$ . We would like to represent  $\iota_\Gamma^*$  microlocally as a  $\lambda$ -FIO. To this end, denote by  $\mathcal{N}$  the conormal bundle of the graph of the inclusion map  $\iota_\Gamma : \Gamma \rightarrow \tilde{X}$  and by  $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{N}^{-1}$  the corresponding inverse canonical relation. In other words,

$$\mathcal{R} := \{(x, \xi; x, \tilde{\xi}) \in T^*\Gamma \times T^*\tilde{X} : x \in \Gamma, \xi = \tilde{\xi}|_{T_x\Gamma}\}.$$

The operator  $\iota_\Gamma^*$  can be considered microlocally as a  $\lambda$ -FIO with Schwartz kernel of the class  $I^{1/4}(\Gamma \times \tilde{X}, \mathcal{R}; \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}})$  which means that the composition  $\iota_\Gamma^* \circ A(\lambda)$  belongs to that class for any classical  $\lambda$ -PDO  $A(\lambda)$  of order 0. Moreover, its principal symbol can be identified with  $(\lambda/2\pi)^{1/4}$  modulo the corresponding  $\frac{1}{2}$ -density (see [56], Sect. A.1.4). In what follows, we shall investigate the composition  $\iota_\Gamma^* H_t(\lambda)$  of  $\lambda$ -FIOs. Firstly, notice that the composition  $\mathcal{R} \circ \mathcal{C}_t$  of the corresponding canonical relations is transversal (see [56], Sect. A.1.4). Recall that  $\pi_1 : \mathcal{C}'_t \rightarrow T^*X$  and  $\pi_2 : \mathcal{C}'_t \rightarrow T^*\Gamma$  are given by  $\pi_1(x, y, \xi, -\eta) = (x, \xi)$  and  $\pi_2(x, y, \xi, -\eta) = (y, \eta)$ . Denote by  $dv(\rho) := dy \wedge d\eta$  the symplectic volume form on  $T^*\Gamma$ . Recall that  $\nu_t(x) \in T_x\tilde{X}|_\Gamma$  is the unit inward normal to  $\Gamma$  related to the metric  $g_t$  and that  $\pi_t^\pm(x, \xi) = (x, \xi_t^\pm) \in \Sigma_t^\pm$  for  $(x, \xi) \in B_t^*\Gamma$ . Moreover,

$$\langle \xi_t^\pm, \nu_t \rangle(x, \xi) := \langle \xi_t^\pm(x, \xi), \nu_t(x) \rangle = \pm \sqrt{1 - r_t(x, \xi')}$$

in the normal coordinates used in Lemma 7.3. Using (7.89) and (7.90) and the theorem about the composition of  $h$ -FIOs one obtains

**Lemma 7.5** *The composition of canonical relations  $\mathcal{R} \circ \mathcal{C}_t$  is transversal and it is a disjoint union  $\Delta^0 \sqcup \mathcal{C}_t^0$  of the diagonal  $\Delta^0$  in  $U \times U$  (for  $s = 0$ ) and the graph  $\mathcal{C}_t^0$  of the billiard ball map  $B_t : U \rightarrow B_t(U)$  (for  $s = T$ ). Moreover,*

$$\iota_\Gamma^* H_t(\lambda) = P_t(\lambda) + G_t(\lambda) + O_M(|\lambda|^{-M}), \quad (7.94)$$

where  $P_t(\lambda)$  is a  $C^1$  family of classical  $\lambda$ -PDOs on  $\Gamma$  of order 0 and  $G_t(\lambda)$  is a  $C^1$  family of  $\lambda$ -FIOs with Schwartz kernels in  $I^0(\Gamma, \Gamma, \mathcal{C}_t^{0'})$ . The principal symbol of the operator  $P_t(\lambda)$  can be identified with

$$\tilde{b}_0(\pi_2^{-1}(\rho)) (2|\langle \xi_t^+, \nu_t \rangle(\rho)|)^{-1/2} |dv(\rho)|^{1/2}, \quad \rho \in U. \quad (7.95)$$

The principal symbol of  $G_t(\lambda)$  can be identified with

$$\tilde{b}_{0,t}(\pi_1^{-1}(\pi_t^-(\rho))) |2\langle \xi_t^-, \nu_t \rangle(\rho)|^{-1/2} e^{i\lambda A_{\gamma_t}(\rho)} |dv(\rho)|^{1/2} \otimes \sigma'_t, \quad \rho \in B_t(U), \quad (7.96)$$

where  $A_{\gamma_t} = \int_{\gamma_t} \xi dx$  is the action along the integral curve  $\gamma_t$  of the Hamiltonian vector field  $X_{h_t}$  starting from  $\pi_t^+(B_t^{-1}(\rho))$  and with endpoint  $\pi_t^-(\rho)$  and  $\sigma'_t$  is a natural section of the Maslov bundle  $M(\mathcal{C}_t^{0'})$ . Moreover, for each  $t^0 \in [0, \delta]$  one can choose  $\sigma'_t$  to be independent of  $t$  in a neighborhood of  $t^0$ .

The Lemma is proved in [56], Sect. A.1.4.

Let  $\Psi(\lambda)$  be a classical  $\lambda$ -PDO of order 0 with frequency set in  $U$  and principal symbol  $\Psi_0(\rho)$ ,  $\rho \in U$ . We take  $\Psi(\lambda)$  as initial data of  $H_0(\lambda)$  as  $s = 0$  setting  $P_t(\lambda) = \Psi(\lambda)$  in Lemma 7.5. Recall that  $\tilde{b}_0$  satisfies (7.93). On the other hand

$$(x', \xi') = B_t(y, \eta) \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \pi_1^{-1}(x', 0, \xi^-) = S^{T_t(y, \eta)}(\pi_2^{-1}(y, \eta))$$

where  $T_t$  is the return time function. Then (7.93) and (7.95) imply

$$\tilde{b}_0(\pi_1^{-1}(x', 0, \xi^-)) = \tilde{b}_0((\pi_2^{-1}(y, \eta))) = \Psi_0(y, \eta)(2|\langle \eta^+, \nu \rangle(y, \eta)|)^{1/2}.$$

Then parameterizing  $\mathcal{C}_t^{0r}$  by the variables  $(y, \eta) \in U$  and using (7.96) we write the principal symbol of  $G_t(\lambda)$  as follows

$$\sigma(G_t(\lambda)) = \Psi_0(y, \eta) \frac{|\langle \eta_t^+, \nu_t \rangle(y, \eta)|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|\langle \xi_t^-, \nu_t \rangle(B_t(y, \eta))|^{1/2}} e^{i\lambda A_t(y, \eta)} |dy \wedge d\eta|^{\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \sigma'_t, \quad (7.97)$$

where  $A_t(y, \eta) = \int_{\gamma_t} \xi dx$  is the action along the integral curve  $\gamma_t$  of the Hamiltonian vector field  $X_{h_t}$  starting from  $\pi_t^+(y, \eta)$  and with endpoint  $\pi_t^-(B_t(y, \eta))$ .

In the same way, using Lemma 7.5 we determine the initial conditions of  $H_{1,t}(\lambda)$  and so on. In this way we obtain a  $C^1$  family of  $\lambda$ -FIOs

$$H_t(\lambda) = H_{0,t}(\lambda) + H_{1,t}(\lambda) + \dots \quad (7.98)$$

with Schwartz kernels in  $I^{-1/4}(\tilde{X}, \Gamma, \mathcal{C}'_t)$  satisfying (7.76) and such that  $P_t(\lambda) = \Psi(\lambda)$ . From now on, to simplify the notations we drop the corresponding  $\frac{1}{2}$ -density. Denote by  $E_t(\lambda)$  a  $C^1$  family of classical  $\lambda$ -PDOs of order 0 on  $\Gamma$  with principal symbols  $E_{0,t} \in C_0^\infty(\tilde{B}_t^* \Gamma)$  such that

$$E_{0,t}(\rho) = |\langle \xi_t^+, \nu_t \rangle(\rho)|^{\frac{1}{2}} = |\langle \xi_t^-, \nu_t \rangle(\rho)|^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (7.99)$$

in a compact neighborhood of  $\overline{U}$  in  $\tilde{B}_t^* \Gamma$ . Then using Egorov's theorem, (7.97) and (7.99) we obtain  $i_\Gamma^* H_t(\lambda)$ . We summarize this construction in the following

**Proposition 7.6** *The  $C^1$  family of  $\lambda$ -FIOs operators  $t \rightarrow H_t(\lambda)$  gives for any half density in  $f$  in  $L^2(\Gamma)$  a family of solution  $u_t = H_t(\lambda)f$  of*

$$(\Delta_t - \lambda^2)u_t = O_N(|\lambda|^{-N})f.$$

Moreover,

$$i_\Gamma^* H_t(\lambda) = \Psi(\lambda) + G_t(\lambda) + O_M(|\lambda|^{-M}), \quad G_t(\lambda) = E_t(\lambda)^{-1} G_t^0(\lambda) E_t(\lambda), \quad (7.100)$$

where  $E_t(\lambda)$  is a family  $\lambda$ -PDOs of order 0 which are of elliptic microlocally in a neighborhood of  $WF'_\lambda(\Psi)$ , the principal symbol of  $G_t^0(\lambda)$  can be identified with

$$\Psi_0(\rho) e^{i\lambda A_t(\rho)} |dv(\rho)|^{\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \sigma'_t, \quad \rho \in U, \quad (7.101)$$

and  $\sigma'_t$  could be chosen to be independent of  $t$  in a small neighborhood of any  $t_0$ .

In particular, the frequency set  $WF'$  of  $G_t(\lambda)$  is contained in  $B_t(U) \times U$ .

We are going to estimate the  $L^2$ -norm of  $u_t = H_t(\lambda)f$ , where  $f$  is a  $\frac{1}{2}$ -density on  $\Gamma$ . Consider the  $L^2$ -adjoint operator  $H_t(\lambda)^*$  of  $H_t(\lambda)$  which is well-defined for any  $\lambda \in \mathcal{D}$  fixed as an operator from  $L^2(\tilde{X})$  to  $L^2(\Gamma)$ . Moreover, it can be considered as a  $\lambda$ -FIO associated with the canonical relation  $\mathcal{C}_t^{-1}$  the Schwartz kernel of which belongs to  $I^{-1/4}(\Gamma, \tilde{X}, (\mathcal{C}_t^{-1})')$ . As in [56], Sect. A.1.4, we obtain

**Proposition 7.7** *The family  $t \rightarrow C_t(\lambda) := H_t(\lambda)^* H_t(\lambda) : L^2(\Gamma) \rightarrow L^2(\Gamma)$  is a  $C^1$  family of classical  $\lambda$ -PDOs of order 0. The principal symbol of  $C_t(\lambda)$  can be identified with by*

$$C_{0,t}(y, \eta) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\tilde{b}_0(s, y, \eta)|^2 ds, \quad (y, \eta), (x, \eta) \in U.$$

Moreover,

$$C_{0,t}(y, \eta) \geq T_t(y, \eta) |\langle \xi_t^+, \nu_t \rangle(y, \eta) |\Psi_0(y, \eta)|^2, \quad (y, \eta) \in U,$$

where  $T_t$  is the return time function. In particular, there exists  $C > 1$  such that

$$C^{-1} \|\Psi(\lambda)f\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} \leq \|H_t(\lambda)f\|_{L^2(X)} \leq C \|\Psi(\lambda)f\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}$$

for each  $(t, \lambda) \in [0, \delta] \times \mathcal{D}$ .

## 7.2 Reduction to the boundary

The reduction to the boundary is a variant of the reflection method for the wave equation. We shall describe it in the case of Dirichlet boundary conditions. In the case of Neumann and more generally of Robin boundary conditions it is done in [56].

Denote by  $(\tilde{X}, g_t)$  a  $C^\infty$  extension of  $(X, g_t)$  and by  $h_t$  the Hamiltonian corresponding to  $g_t$  via the Legendre transform. Consider a  $C^1$  family of Kronecker invariant tori  $[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow \Lambda_t(\omega) \subset \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_t^* \Gamma$  of  $B_t$  having frequencies in the set  $\Omega_\kappa^0$  of points of positive Lebesgue density in  $\Omega_\kappa = (\Omega - \kappa) \cap D(\kappa, \tau)$ , where  $\Omega = B(\omega_0, \varepsilon)$ ,  $0 < \kappa < \varepsilon/2 \ll 1$  and  $0 \leq \delta \leq 1$ . For  $0 < \delta \ll 1$  such families of Kronecker invariant tori of  $B_t$  are provided by Theorem 6.1. Denote by

$$\mathcal{T}_t^j := \cup \{B_t^j(\Lambda_t(\omega)) : \omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0\} \subset \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_t^* \Gamma$$

the coresponding union of the invariant tori of  $P_t \circ B_t^j$  for  $0 \leq j < m$  and set

$$\mathcal{T}^j := \cup \{\mathcal{T}_t^j, 0 \leq j < m.$$

Fix  $t_0 \in [0, \delta]$  and choose open sets  $U_j \subset V_j \subset T^* \Gamma$  for  $0 \leq j \leq m$  and a sufficiently small interval  $J \subset [0, \delta]$  around  $t_0$  such that

$$\mathcal{T}^j \subset U_j \subset \subset V_j \subset \subset \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_t \Gamma \quad \text{and} \quad B_t(V_j) \subset U_{j+1}$$

for each  $t \in J$  and  $0 \leq j \leq m-1$  and

$$\overline{U}_0 \cup \overline{U}_m \subset V_m \subset \subset \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_t \Gamma$$

for each  $t \in J$ . The relation  $U \subset \subset V$  means here that  $\overline{U} \subset V$  where  $\overline{U}$  is the closure of  $U$ . We suppose that the  $C^1$  family of exact symplectic mappings

$$J \ni t \rightarrow P_t$$

admits a  $C^1$  family of BNFs in a neighborhood  $U$  of  $\overline{V}_0$  in the sense of Definition 6.2 (see also Theorem 6.1). In other words, we suppose that there exist  $C^1$ -smooth with respect to  $t \in J$  families of exact symplectic diffeomorphisms  $\chi_t : \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \chi_t(\mathbb{A}) \subset U$  and of real valued functions  $L_t \in C^\infty(D)$  and  $R_t^0 \in C^\infty(\mathbb{A})$  where  $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times D$  and  $D = \nabla L_{t_0}^*(\Omega)$  such that for each  $t \in J$  the following holds

1.  $\overline{V}_0 \subset \chi_t(\mathbb{A})$ ;
2.  $\Lambda_t(\omega) = \chi_t(\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \{I_t(\omega)\}) \subset U_0$  for  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$ , where  $I_t(\omega)$  is given by (1.6);
3. The function

$$\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times D \ni (x, I) \mapsto \phi_t(x, I) := \langle x, I \rangle - L_t(I) - R_t^0(x, I)$$

is a generating function of the exact symplectic map

$$P_t^0 := \chi_t^{-1} \circ P_t \circ \chi_t : \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$$

in the sense of Definition 4.1;

4.  $\nabla L_t : D \rightarrow \Omega$  is a diffeomorphism and  $L_t = L_{t_0}$  outside  $D^1 := \nabla L_{t_0}^*(\Omega - \kappa/2)$ ;
5.  $R_t^0$  is flat at  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times E_t^\kappa$ , where  $E_t^\kappa = \nabla L_t^*(\Omega_\kappa^0)$ .

Chose the  $\lambda$ -PDO  $\Psi(\lambda)$  giving the “initial data” of the operators  $H_t(\lambda)$  in (7.100) such that

$$\text{WF}'_\lambda(\Psi - \text{Id}) \cap \overline{V}_j = \emptyset \quad \forall 0 \leq j \leq m. \quad (7.102)$$

Recall from Proposition 7.6 that

$$i_{\Gamma}^* H_t(\lambda) = \Psi(\lambda) + G_t(\lambda) + O_M(|\lambda|^{-M})$$

where  $G_t(\lambda)$  is described in (7.100) and (7.100). Take now a classical  $\lambda$ -pseudodifferential operator  $\lambda$ -PDO  $\Psi_0(\lambda)$  such that

$$\text{WF}'_\lambda(\Psi_0) \subset V_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{WF}'_\lambda(\Psi_0 - \text{Id}) \cap \overline{U}_0 = \emptyset.$$

Consider the “outgoing” solution of the Helmlotz equation

$$(\Delta_t - \lambda^2)u_t = O_N(|\lambda|^{-N})f \quad (7.103)$$

for  $\lambda \in \mathcal{D}$  and  $t \in J$  with “initial data”  $\Psi_0(\lambda)f$  which is given by  $u_t := H_t^0(\lambda)f$ , where

$$H_t^0(\lambda) = H_t(\lambda)\Psi_0(\lambda).$$

Recall that  $O_N(|\lambda|^{-N}) : L^2(\Gamma) \rightarrow L^2(\tilde{X})$  stands here for a family of operators

$$A_t(\lambda) : L^2(\Gamma) \rightarrow L^2(\tilde{X})$$

such that

$$\|A_t(\lambda)\|_{L^2} \leq C_N(1 + |\lambda|)^{-N}$$

for each  $t \in J$  and  $\lambda \in \mathcal{D}$  where  $C_N > 0$  is constant independent of  $t$  and of  $\lambda$ . Then

$$i_\Gamma^* H_t^0(\lambda) = \Psi_0(\lambda) + G_t(\lambda) \Psi_0(\lambda) + O_M(|\lambda|^{-M})$$

since  $\text{WF}'_\lambda((\Psi - \text{Id})\Psi_0) = \emptyset$  in view of (7.102).

To satisfy the “boundary conditions” on  $U^1$  in the case when  $m \geq 2$  we use the reflexion method. Let  $\Psi_1(\lambda)$  be a classical  $\lambda$ -PDO such that

$$\text{WF}'_\lambda(\Psi_1) \subset V_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{WF}'_\lambda(\Psi_1 - \text{Id}) \cap \overline{U}_1 = \emptyset.$$

Set

$$H_t^1(\lambda) = H_t(\lambda) \Psi_1(\lambda) G_t(\lambda) \Psi_0(\lambda)$$

and consider

$$u_t(\lambda) = \tilde{H}_t(\lambda) f := H_t^0(\lambda) f - H_t^1(\lambda) f.$$

Then  $u_t$  satisfies (7.103) and it satisfies microlocally the Dirichlet boundary conditions on  $U_1$ . Notice that  $\text{WF}_\lambda(i_\Gamma^*(u_t)) \subset U_0 \cap U_2$ . Similarly if  $m > 2$  one can treat the boundary conditions in  $U_j$  for any  $0 < j < m$  which leads to a solution  $u_t = \tilde{H}_t(\lambda) f$  satisfying the boundary conditions microlocally in  $U_j$  for each  $0 < j < m$ . Let  $\Psi_j(\lambda)$ ,  $0 \leq j \leq m-1$  be a classical  $\lambda$ -PDO such that

$$\text{WF}'_\lambda(\Psi_j) \subset V_j \quad \text{and} \quad \text{WF}'_\lambda(\Psi_j - \text{Id}) \cap \overline{U}_j = \emptyset.$$

We set  $H_t^0(\lambda) = H_t(\lambda) \Psi_0(\lambda)$  if  $m = 1$  and

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{H}_t(\lambda) f &= \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} (-1)^j H_t^j(\lambda) f \quad \text{where} \\ H_t^j(\lambda) &= H_t(\lambda) \Psi_{m-1}(\lambda) G_t(\lambda) \Psi_{m-2}(\lambda) \cdots G_t(\lambda) \Psi_0(\lambda) \end{cases} \quad (7.104)$$

if  $m \geq 2$ . Then  $u_t$  satisfies (7.103) and

$$\text{WF}_\lambda(i_\Gamma^*(u_t)) \subset U_0 \cap B_t(U_{m-1}) \subset\subset V_m.$$

More precisely,

$$i_\Gamma^*(u^t) = \Psi_0(\lambda) f - M_t(\lambda) f + O_N(\lambda^{-N}) f$$

where  $M_t(\lambda) := -G_t(\lambda) \Psi_0(\lambda)$  for  $m = 1$  and

$$M_t(\lambda) := (-1)^{m-1} G_t(\lambda) \Psi_{m-1}(\lambda) \cdots G_t(\lambda) \Psi_0(\lambda)$$

if  $m \geq 2$ . Taking into account (7.100) we obtain  $M_t(\lambda) = E(\lambda)^{-1} M_t^0(\lambda) E(\lambda)$ , where

$$M_t^0(\lambda) := (-1)^{m-1} Q_t(\lambda) \Psi_{m-1}(\lambda) \cdots Q_t(\lambda) \Psi_0(\lambda). \quad (7.105)$$

Moreover, using Proposition 7.6 and the theorem about the composition of  $\lambda$ -FIOs (here we use it in the simple case of canonical transformations) and parameterizing  $\text{graph}(P_t) \subset V_m \times V_0$  by its projection on  $V_0$  we obtain that for each  $t \in J$  the principal symbol of  $M_t^0(\lambda)$  is given by

$$(-1)^{m-1} \exp(i\lambda A_t(x, \xi)) |dv(\rho)|^{\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \sigma'_m$$

over  $U_0$ , where

$$A_t(x, \xi) = \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} A_t(x_t^j, \xi_t^j), \quad (x_t^j, \xi_t^j) = B_t^j(x, \xi),$$

is the action along the corresponding broken geodesic and  $\sigma'_m$  is a “natural” section of the corresponding Keller-Maslov bundle which can be chosen to be independent of  $t \in J$ .

Let  $\psi_0(\lambda)$  be a classical  $\lambda$ -PDO of order zero such that

$$\text{WF}'(\psi_0(\lambda)) \subset U_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{WF}'(\psi_0(\lambda) - \text{Id}) \cap \mathcal{T}^0 = \emptyset.$$

We summarize the above construction by the following

**Proposition 7.8** *Let  $v_{t,\lambda} \in L^2(\Gamma)$  and  $u_{t,\lambda} = \tilde{H}_t(\lambda)\psi_0(\lambda)v_{t,\lambda}$  where  $(t, \lambda) \in J \times \mathcal{D}$ . Then*

$$\begin{cases} (\Delta_t - \lambda^2)u_{t,\lambda} &= O_N(\lambda_q^{-N})u_{t,\lambda}, \\ i_\Gamma^* u_{t,\lambda} &= O_N(\lambda_q^{-N})u_{t,\lambda} \end{cases}$$

if and only if

$$(M_t^0(\lambda) - \text{Id})\psi_0(\lambda)v_{t,\lambda} = O_N(\lambda_q^{-N})v_{t,\lambda}. \quad (7.106)$$

The structure of the monodromy operator  $M_t^0(\lambda)$  is given by

**Proposition 7.9** *The canonical relation of  $M_t^0(\lambda) := E_t(\lambda)M_t(\lambda)E_t(\lambda)^{-1}$  is given by the graph  $\text{graph}(P_t) \subset V_m \times V_0$  of the symplectic map  $P_t = B_t^m : V_0 \rightarrow V_m$ , which is  $C^1$  with respect to  $t$ . The family  $J \ni t \rightarrow M_t^0(\lambda)$  of classical  $\lambda$ -FIO of order 0 with a large parameter  $\lambda \in \mathcal{D}$  is  $C^1$  smooth with respect to  $t \in J$ . Parameterizing  $\text{graph } P_t$  by its projection on  $V_0$  for  $t \in J$ , the principal symbol of  $M_t^0(\lambda)$  becomes*

$$\sigma(M_t^0) = (-1)^{m-1} \exp(i\lambda A_t(x, \xi)) |dv(\rho)|^{\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \sigma'_m$$

over  $U_0$ , where  $\sigma'_m$  is a “natural” section of the corresponding Keller-Maslov bundle which does not depend on  $t \in J$ .

### 7.3 Quantum Birkhoff Normal Form

Using the  $C^1$  family of exact symplectic transformations  $\chi_t$  given by Theorem 6.1 we identify the first cohomology groups  $H^1(\Lambda_t(\omega), \mathbb{Z}) = H^1(\mathbb{T}^{n-1}, \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$  for  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$  and  $t \in J$ , and we denote by  $\vartheta_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$  the Maslov class of the invariant tori  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$ . Notice that  $\vartheta_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$  does not depend on  $t \in J$  and  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$ . Consider as in [4] the flat Hermitian line bundle  $\mathbb{L}$  over  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1}$  associated to the representation  $\varrho : \mathbb{Z}^{n-1} \rightarrow SU(1)$  of the fundamental one group  $\pi_1(\mathbb{T}^{n-1}) = \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$  defined by  $\varrho(k) = \exp(i\frac{\pi}{2}\langle \vartheta_0, k \rangle)$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$  (see [32], Sect. 1.2). More precisely,  $\mathbb{L}$  is the quotient of  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{C}$  by the action of  $\mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$  given by  $k.(x, z) = (x + 2\pi k, \varrho(k)z)$ . Then sections  $s$  of  $\mathbb{L}$  can be identified canonically with smooth functions  $\tilde{s} : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  such that

$$\tilde{s}(x + 2\pi k) = e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}\langle \vartheta_0, k \rangle} \tilde{s}(x) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}, k \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}. \quad (7.107)$$

An orthonormal basis of  $L^2(\mathbb{T}^{n-1}, \mathbb{L})$  is given by  $e_k$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$ , where

$$\tilde{e}_k(x) = \exp(i\langle k + \vartheta_0/4, x \rangle).$$

We quantize the family of exact symplectic transformations  $\chi_t : \mathbb{A} = \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times D \rightarrow T^*\Gamma$  as in [4], Sect. 5 and [56], Sect. 3.3. Denote by  $\mathcal{C}_{\chi_t}$  the graph of  $\chi_t$  in  $T^*\Gamma \times T^*\mathbb{T}^{n-1}$  and by  $\mathcal{C}'_{\chi_t} = j(\mathcal{C}_{\chi_t})$  the corresponding Lagrangian submanifold of  $T^*(\Gamma \times \mathbb{T}^{n-1})$ , where  $j$  is defined in (7.75). Consider the class of  $\lambda$ -FIOs  $T_t(\lambda) : C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^{n-1}, \mathbb{L}) \rightarrow C^\infty(\Gamma, \mathbb{C})$  of order 0 associated with the canonical relation  $\mathcal{C}_{\chi_t}$ . The Schwartz kernel  $K_{T_t(\lambda)}$  of  $T_t(\lambda)$  belongs to the class  $I^0(\Gamma \times \mathbb{T}^{n-1}, \mathcal{C}'_{\chi_t}; p_2^*(\mathbb{L}))$ , where  $p_2 : \Gamma \times \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^{n-1}$  is the projection on the second factor. Recall from [4], Sect. 5, that the principal symbol  $\sigma(K_{T_t})(\lambda)$  of  $K_{T_t(\lambda)}$  can be canonically identified with a smooth function in  $T^*\mathbb{T}^{n-1}$ . Indeed,  $\sigma(K_{T_t})(\lambda)$  belongs to the symbol class  $S^0(\mathcal{C}'_{\chi_t}, M(\mathcal{C}'_{\chi_t}) \otimes \pi_2^*(\mathbb{L}'))$ , where  $\pi_2 : \mathcal{C}'_{\chi_t} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times D$  and  $\pi_2 \circ j : \mathcal{C}_{\chi_t} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times D$  is the restriction at  $\mathcal{C}_{\chi_t}$  of the projection  $T^*\Gamma \times T^*\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \rightarrow T^*\mathbb{T}^{n-1}$  on the second factor while  $\mathbb{L}'$  is the dual bundle to  $\mathbb{L}$  (the base manifold of  $\mathbb{L}$  and  $\mathbb{L}'$  here is  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times D$  instead of  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1}$ ). On the other hand,  $M(\mathcal{C}'_{\chi_t}) = \pi_2^*(\mathbb{L})$  and using the parametrization of  $\mathcal{C}'_{\chi_t}$  given by  $\pi_2$  we identify the above class of symbols with  $S^0(\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times D, \mathbb{L} \otimes \mathbb{L}')$  which can be canonically identified with  $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times D)$  since  $\mathbb{L} \otimes \mathbb{L}'$  is trivial (cf. [23], Chapter I, 3.7). This allows us to obtain a  $\lambda$ -FIO  $T_t(\lambda)$  of order 0 associated to the canonical relation  $\mathcal{C}_{\chi_t}$ , which is microlocally unitary over  $\mathbb{A}^0 := \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times D^0$ , where  $D^0$  is a neighborhood of  $\cup_{t \in J} E_t^\kappa$  in  $D$  and

$$E_t^\kappa = \nabla L_t^*(\Omega_\kappa^0) = I_t(\Omega_\kappa^0)$$

has been defined in 4, Theorem 6.1. This means that

$$\text{WF}'(T_t(\lambda)^* T_t(\lambda) - \text{Id}) \cap \mathbb{A}^0 = \emptyset.$$

Trivializing the  $\frac{1}{2}$ -density bundle of  $\mathcal{C}'_{\chi_t}$  by  $\pi_2^*|dv|^{\frac{1}{2}}$ , where  $dv$  is the symplectic volume form on  $T^*\mathbb{T}^{n-1}$ , we take the principal symbol of  $T_t(\lambda)$  to be equal to one in  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times D^0$  modulo a Liouville factor  $\exp(i\lambda\Psi_t(\varphi, I))$ , where the function  $\Psi_t$  is real valued. Consider the  $C^1$  family of  $\lambda$ -FIOs of order zero

$$M_t^1(\lambda) := T_t(\lambda)^* M_t^0(\lambda) T_t(\lambda) : C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^{n-1}, \mathbb{L}) \rightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^{n-1}, \mathbb{L}).$$

The corresponding canonical relation  $\mathcal{C}_t$  is just the graph of  $P_t^0 = \chi_t^{-1} \circ P_t \circ \chi_t$  i.e.

$$\mathcal{C}_t := \{(P_t^0(\rho), \rho) : \rho \in \mathbb{A}\}. \quad (7.108)$$

Denote by  $\mathcal{C}'_t$  the corresponding Lagrangian submanifold of  $T^*(\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{T}^{n-1})$ . Using the theorem about the composition of  $\lambda$ -FIOs in the special case of canonical transformations we obtain that the Schwartz kernel of  $M_t^1(\lambda)$  belongs to  $I^0(\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{T}^{n-1}, \mathcal{C}'_t; M(\mathcal{C}'_t) \otimes \text{End}(\mathbb{L}))$ . Let us find its principal symbol, parameterizing  $\mathcal{C}'$  by the variables  $\rho = (\varphi, I) \in \mathbb{A}$ .

**Lemma 7.10** *The principal symbol of  $M_t^1(\lambda)$  is given by*

$$\sigma(M_t^1)(\lambda) = (-1)^m \exp(i\lambda f_t) s_{t,0} \otimes \sigma_0 \otimes |dv(\rho)|^{1/2}$$

where  $s_{t,0}$  is a  $C^1$  family of smooth function in  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times D$  such that  $s_{t,0}(\varphi, I) = 1$  in  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times D^0$ ,  $dv(\rho)$  the symplectic volume form on  $T^*\mathbb{T}^{n-1}$ ,  $\sigma_0$  is a natural section of the Keller-Maslov bundle  $M(\mathcal{C}'_t)$  independent of  $t$  and

$$f_t(\varphi, I) = A_t(\chi_t(\varphi, I)) + \Psi_t(\varphi, I) - \Psi_t(P^0(\varphi, I)), \quad (\varphi, I) \in \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times D. \quad (7.109)$$

*Proof.* Notice that  $\text{End}(\mathbb{L}) \cong \mathbb{L} \otimes \mathbb{L}'$  is trivial as a bundle over  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times D$ , hence, smooth sections can be canonically identified with smooth functions in  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times D$ . Then parameterizing  $\mathcal{C}'_t$  by the variables  $\rho = (\varphi, I) \in \mathbb{A}$  and using the  $\lambda$ -FIO calculus and Proposition 7.9 we obtain the principal symbol of  $M_t^1(\lambda)$ . To prove (7.109) we write microlocally the Schwartz kernels of the corresponding  $\lambda$ -FIOs in as oscillatory integrals of the form (7.87) with suitable phase functions and then we evaluate the phase function of the composition at the stationary points. The claim that  $\sigma_0$  is natural and independent of  $t$  follows from the fact that the section  $\sigma'_m$  in Proposition 7.9 is natural and from the composition law of FIOs.  $\square$

Recall that the Lagrangian manifolds  $\mathcal{C}'_t$  are generated by the  $C^1$  family of functions  $\Phi_t(x, y, I) = \phi_t(x, I) - \langle y, I \rangle$ , where

$$\phi_t(x, I) = \langle x, I \rangle - L_t(I) - R_t^0(x, I)$$

satisfies 3-5 in Sect. 7.2 (see also Definition 6.2 and Theorem 6.1).

**Proposition 7.11** *We have*

$$T_t(\lambda)^* M_t^0(\lambda) T_t(\lambda) = e^{i\pi\vartheta/2} W_t(\lambda)$$

where  $\vartheta \in \mathbb{Z}$  is a Maslov's index independent of  $t \in J$  and

$$J \ni t \rightarrow W_t(\lambda) : C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^{n-1}, \mathbb{L}) \rightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^{n-1}, \mathbb{L})$$

is a  $C^1$  family of  $\lambda$ -FIOs of order zero with canonical relations given by the graph of  $P_t^0$  over  $\mathbb{A}$ . Moreover, the Schwartz kernel of  $W_t(\lambda)$  is of the form

$$\widetilde{W}_t(x, y, \lambda) |dx|^{\frac{1}{2}} |dy|^{\frac{1}{2}} = \left( \frac{\lambda}{2\pi} \right)^{n-1} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} e^{i\lambda(\phi_t(x, I) - \langle y, I \rangle)} w_t(x, I, \lambda) dI \right) |dx|^{\frac{1}{2}} |dy|^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (7.110)$$

where  $t \rightarrow w_t = \sum_{j=0}^\infty w_{t,j}$  is a  $C^1$  family of classical amplitudes  $2\pi$ -periodic with respect to  $x$  and  $w_{t,0}(x, I) = 1$  for  $(x, I) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times D^0$ .

*Proof.* The Schwartz kernel of  $M_t^1(\lambda)$  can be written in the form (7.110) with a phase function  $C + \Phi_t(x, y, I)$ , where  $C$  is a constant since  $\Phi_t$  is a globally defined generating function of  $\mathcal{C}'_t$ . We are going to show that  $C = 0$ . Indeed, the exponent on the Liouville factor picked up by these phase functions is

$$C + \langle I, \nabla L_t(I) \rangle - L_t(I) + \langle I, \nabla_I R_t^0(\varphi, I) \rangle - R_t^0(\varphi, I) = f_t^0(\varphi, I),$$

then taking  $(\varphi, I) \in E_t^\kappa$  and using Lemma 6.4, (7.109) and the equality  $R_t^0|_{E_t^\kappa} = 0$  we get  $C = 0$ . Trivializing the Maslov bundles  $M(\mathcal{C}'_t)$  by the  $C^1$  family of phase functions  $\Phi_t$  we get  $(\sigma_0)_{\Phi_t} = \exp(i\frac{\pi}{2}\vartheta_1)$  for some  $\vartheta_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$  independent of  $t$  since  $\sigma_0$  does not depend on  $t$ . We set  $\vartheta = \vartheta_1 + m\pi$ . Moreover, by (7.73) and (7.74) we obtain that  $|d_{C_{\mathbb{F}}}| = dx dI$ . Hence,  $w_{t,0}(x, I) = s_{t,0}(\text{pr}(x), I) = 1$  for each  $(x, I) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times D^0$ .  $\square$

In the case of Neumann and Robin boundary conditions we have  $\vartheta = \vartheta_1$ .

Our aim is to make  $w_{t,j}(x, I)$  independent of the angle variable  $x$  for  $I \in E_t^\kappa$  conjugating  $W_t(\lambda)$  by a suitable  $C^1$  in  $t$  family of  $\lambda$ -PDOs which are elliptic on  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times D^0$ .

**Proposition 7.12** *There exists a  $C^1$  family of  $\lambda$ -PDOs  $J \ni t \rightarrow A_t(\lambda)$  of order 0 acting on  $C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^{n-1}, \mathbb{L})$  and a  $C^1$  family of  $\lambda$ -FIO  $J \ni t \rightarrow W_t^0(\lambda)$  of the form (7.110) such that*

$$W_t(\lambda)A_t(\lambda) = A_t(\lambda)W_t^0(\lambda) + Z_t(\lambda), \quad (7.111)$$

where

(1) the full symbols of  $A_t(\lambda)$  and of  $W_t^0(\lambda)$  are

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(A_t)(\varphi, I, \lambda) &:= a_t(\varphi, I, \lambda) \sim \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \lambda^{-j} a_t^j(\varphi, I, \lambda) \text{ and} \\ \sigma(W_t^0)(\varphi, I, \lambda) &:= p_t(I, \lambda) \sim \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \lambda^{-j} p_t^j(I), \end{aligned}$$

where  $J \ni t \rightarrow a_t(\varphi, I, \lambda)$  and  $J \ni t \rightarrow p_t(I, \lambda)$  are  $C^1$  families of classical symbols and  $a_t^0(\varphi, I) = 1$  and  $p_t^0(I) = 1$  for  $I \in D^0$ ,

(2)  $J \ni t \rightarrow Z_t(\lambda)$  is a  $C^1$  family of  $\lambda$ -FIOs of order 0 of the form (7.110) with symbols

$$S_t(\varphi, I, \lambda) \sim \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \lambda^{-j} S_t^j(\varphi, I)$$

such that the functions  $S_t^j$ ,  $j \geq 0$ , are flat on  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times E_t^\kappa$ .

*Proof.* The proof of the proposition is similar to that in [3] and [56]. First, comparing the symbols of order  $-j$  of the left and the right hand side of (7.111) we shall derive the corresponding homological equation. Set

$$\phi_t^0(x, I) = L_t(I) + R_t(x, I).$$

We write the Schwartz kernel of the operator  $W_t(\lambda)A_t(\lambda)$  of the form (7.110) with amplitude

$$u_t(x, I, \lambda) = \left(\frac{\lambda}{2\pi}\right)^{n-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n-2}} e^{i\lambda(\langle x-z, \xi-I \rangle - (\phi_t^0(x, \xi) - \phi_t^0(x, I)))} w_t(x, \xi, \lambda) a_t(z, I, \lambda) d\xi dz,$$

which belongs to  $C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times D)$  for each  $\lambda$  fixed. Changing the variables we write  $u_t(x, I, \lambda)$  of the form

$$\left(\frac{\lambda}{2\pi}\right)^{n-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n-2}} e^{-i\lambda\langle v, \eta \rangle} w_t(x, I + \eta, \lambda) a_t(v + x + K_t(I, \eta) + H_t(x, I, \eta), I, \lambda) d\eta dv,$$

where  $K_t(I, \eta) := \int_0^1 \nabla_I L_t(I + s\eta) ds$  and  $H_t(x, I, \eta) := \int_0^1 \nabla_I R_t(x, I + s\eta) ds$ . Note that  $K_t(I, 0) = \nabla L_t(I)$ . Moreover,  $\partial_I^\alpha \partial_\eta^\beta H_t(x, I, 0) = 0$  for each  $I \in E_t^\kappa$  and any  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$  since the function  $I \rightarrow R_t(x, I)$  is flat at  $E_t^\kappa$  for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  in view of 5, Sect. 7.2. Using the Taylor formula for the amplitude at  $v = 0$  and integrating by parts we get

$$u_t(x, I, \lambda) \sim \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} w_t^j(x, I) \lambda^{-j}$$

where

$$u_t^j(x, I) := \sum_{r+s+|\gamma|=j} \frac{1}{\gamma!} [D_\eta^\gamma (a_t^r(x, I + \eta) \partial_x^\gamma a_t^s(x + K_t(I, \eta) + H_t(x, I, \eta), I))]_{|\eta|=0}.$$

In the same way we write the Schwartz kernel of  $A_t(\lambda)W_t^0(\lambda)$  in the form (7.110) with amplitude  $q_t(x, I, \lambda)$  given by the oscillatory integral

$$\left(\frac{\lambda}{2\pi}\right)^{n-1} p^0(I, \lambda) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n-2}} e^{i\lambda(\langle x-z, \xi-I \rangle - (\phi_t^0(z, I) - \phi_t^0(x, I)))} a_t(x, \xi, \lambda) d\xi dz.$$

Changing the variables we obtain  $q_t = q_t^0 + q_t^1$ , where  $q_t^0(x, I, \lambda) = a_t(x, I, \lambda)p_t(I, \lambda)$  and  $q_t^1(x, I, \lambda)$  is given by

$$\left(\frac{\lambda}{2\pi}\right)^{n-1} p_t(I, \lambda) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n-2}} e^{-i\lambda\langle v, \eta \rangle} [a_t(x, \eta + I + H_t^1(x, v, I), \lambda) - a_t(x, \eta + I, \lambda)] d\eta dv,$$

where  $H_t^1(x, v, I) = \int_0^1 \nabla_x R_t(x + \tau v, I) d\tau$ . Moreover, all the derivatives of  $H_t^1(x, v, I)$  vanish for  $I \in E_t^\kappa$  since the function  $I \rightarrow R_t(x, I)$  is flat at  $E_t^\kappa$  for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ . In this way we obtain for any  $j \geq 1$  that

$$S_t^j(\varphi, I) = a_t^j(\varphi + \nabla L_t(I), I) - a_t^j(\varphi, I) - p_t^j(I) - F^j(\varphi, I, t), \quad (7.112)$$

where  $F^j$  is a polynomial of  $\partial_\varphi^\alpha \partial_I^\beta a_t^l$  and  $\partial_I^\beta p_t^l$  for  $l < j$  and  $|\alpha| + |\beta| \leq 2j$  and of  $\partial_I^\beta L_t$  for  $|\beta| \leq 2j + 1$ .

We are looking for functions  $a_t^j$  and  $p_t^j(I)$  such that  $S_t^j(\varphi, I) = 0$  on  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times E_t^\kappa$ . We shall solve this equation recursively with respect to  $j$  changing the variables by  $I = I_t(\omega)$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega$ , and we consider  $\Omega$  as a subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ . Set  $f(\varphi, \omega, t) := a_t^j(\varphi, I_t(\omega))$ ,  $c(\omega, t) := p_t^j(I_t(\omega))$  and  $F(\varphi, \omega, t) := F^j(\varphi, I_t(\omega), t)$ . Then we get the homological equation

$$f(\varphi + \omega, \omega, t) - f(\varphi, I, t) = c(\omega, t) + F(\varphi, \omega, t), \quad \omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0. \quad (7.113)$$

We are looking for smooth functions  $f$  and  $c$  on  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \Omega$  and  $\Omega$  respectively, which solve (7.113) for every  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$ . We have the following

**Lemma 7.13** *Let  $J \ni t \rightarrow F(\cdot, \cdot, t) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \Omega)$  be a  $C^1$  family of functions such that  $F(\varphi, \omega, t) = 0$  for each  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$ . Then there exist  $C^1$  families functions  $J \ni t \rightarrow f(\cdot, \cdot, t) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \Omega)$  and  $J \ni t \rightarrow c(\cdot, t) \in C^\infty(\Omega)$  such that the function*

$$(\varphi, \omega) \rightarrow S(\varphi, \omega, t) := f(\varphi + \omega, \omega, t) - f(\varphi, I, t) - c(\omega, t) - F(\varphi, \omega, t)$$

*is flat at  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \Omega_\kappa^0$  for each  $t$  fixed.*

*Proof.* Given  $g \in L^1(\mathbb{T}^{n-1})$  we denote by  $\hat{g}_k$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$ , its Fourier coefficients. For any  $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$  we have

$$\hat{S}_k(\omega, t) = \hat{f}_k(\omega, t) \left( e^{i\langle \omega, k \rangle} - 1 \right) - c(\omega, t) - \hat{F}_k(\omega, t).$$

We set  $c(\omega, t) = -\hat{F}_0(\omega, t)$ , which gives  $\hat{S}_0(\omega, t) = 0$ . We are going to find  $S_k(\omega, t)$  for  $k \neq 0$ . To this end we choose  $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  such that

$$0 \leq \phi \leq 1, \quad \phi(x) = 1 \text{ for } |x| \leq \pi/5 \text{ and } \phi(x) = 0 \text{ for } |x| \geq \pi/4.$$

For any  $0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$  set

$$\phi_k(x) := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \phi((x - 2\pi j)|k|^\tau \kappa^{-1}).$$

We have  $|k|^\tau \kappa^{-1} \geq \kappa^{-1} > 1$ , hence,  $\phi((x - 2\pi j)|k|^\tau \kappa^{-1}) = 0$  for  $j \neq [x]_\pi$ , where  $[x]_\pi/2\pi \in \mathbb{Z}$  is the unique integer such that  $-\pi \leq x - [x]_\pi < \pi$ . Then  $\phi_k(x) = \phi(\{x\}|k|^\tau \kappa^{-1})$ , where  $\{x\} = x - [x]_\pi$ . Fix  $k \neq 0$  in  $\mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$  and consider the smooth function

$$\omega \rightarrow z_k(\omega) = 1 - e^{i\langle \omega, k \rangle} + \frac{1}{3}\kappa(1 + |k|)^{-\tau} \phi_k(\langle \omega, k \rangle).$$

**Lemma 7.14** *We have*

$$|z_k(\omega)| \geq \frac{1}{3}\kappa(1 + |k|)^{-\tau} \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega. \quad (7.114)$$

Moreover,

$$z_k(\omega) = 1 - e^{i\langle \omega, k \rangle} \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega_\kappa. \quad (7.115)$$

*Proof.* Let  $\Omega^1$  be the set of all  $\omega \in \Omega$  such that

$$\pi/6 \leq |\{\langle \omega, k \rangle\}| |k|^\tau \kappa^{-1} \leq \pi$$

and  $\Omega^2$  the set of all  $\omega \in \Omega$  such that

$$|\{\langle \omega, k \rangle\}| |k|^\tau \kappa^{-1} \leq \pi/6.$$

For every  $\omega \in \Omega^1$  we have

$$|1 - \exp(i\langle k, \omega \rangle)| = 2|\sin(\frac{1}{2}\{\langle \omega, k \rangle\})| \geq \frac{4}{\pi}|\{\langle \omega, k \rangle\}| \geq \frac{2}{3}\kappa(1 + |k|)^{-\tau}.$$

This implies

$$|z_k(\omega)| \geq \frac{1}{3}\kappa(1 + |k|)^{-\tau} \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega^1.$$

If  $\omega \in \Omega^2$ , then  $\phi_k(\langle \omega, k \rangle) = \phi(\{\langle \omega, k \rangle\}|k|^\tau \kappa^{-1}) = 1$ , hence,

$$\operatorname{Re}(z_k(\omega)) \geq \frac{1}{3}\kappa(1 + |k|)^{-\tau}$$

which proves (7.114). Moreover, for any  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa$  we have  $\phi_k(\langle \omega, k \rangle) = \phi(\{\langle \omega, k \rangle\}|k|^\tau \kappa^{-1}) = 0$  in view of (1.2), which implies (7.115).  $\square$

Let us go back to the homological equation (7.113). For every  $k \neq 0$  we set

$$\hat{f}_k(\omega, t) := -\frac{\hat{F}_k(\omega, t)}{z_k(\omega)}.$$

Using Lemma 7.14 we obtain that the function

$$(\varphi, I) \rightarrow f(\varphi, \omega, t) := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}} \hat{f}_k(\omega, t) e^{i\langle \varphi, k \rangle}$$

belongs to  $C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \Omega)$  for any  $t$  fixed and the map  $J \ni t \rightarrow f(\cdot, \cdot, t) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \Omega)$  is  $C^1$ . Hence, the map  $J \ni t \rightarrow S(\cdot, \cdot, t) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \Omega)$  is  $C^1$  as well. Moreover,  $F_k(\varphi, \omega, t) = 0$  for each  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$  and  $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$  and using (7.115) we obtain that  $S(\varphi, \omega, t) = 0$  for  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$ . Now Lemma 6.3 implies that the function  $\omega \rightarrow S(\varphi, \omega, t)$  is flat at  $\Omega_\kappa^0$  for each  $\varphi$  and  $t$  fixed. Now using This completes the proof of Lemma 7.13.  $\square$

Using Lemma 7.13 we find  $a_t^j$  and  $p_t^j(I)$  such that  $\partial_I^\alpha S_t^j(\varphi, I, t) = 0$  for every  $I \in E_t^\kappa$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$ . Using Lemma 7.1 we find  $C^1$  of realisations  $S_t(\varphi, I, \lambda)$  and  $p_t(I, \lambda)$  of the formal symbols and such that which completes the proof of Proposition 7.12.  $\square$

We are looking for  $C^1$  families of solutions  $t \rightarrow (\lambda(t), v(t))$  of the equation (7.106) of the form

$$v(t) = E_t(\lambda)^{-1} T_t(\lambda) A_t(\lambda) e(t)$$

for  $t \in J$ . In view of Proposition 7.12,  $e(t)$  should satisfy the equation

$$e^{i\pi\vartheta/2} W_t^0(\lambda) e(t) + e^{i\pi\vartheta/2} S_t(\lambda) e(t) = e(t) + O_N(|\lambda|^{-N}) e(t). \quad (7.116)$$

Natural candidates for  $e(t)$  are the sections  $e_k$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$ . Since  $\lambda \in \mathcal{D}$  may be complex, we consider almost analytic extensions of order  $M \geq 2N + n + 2$  of the functions  $\phi_t^0$ ,  $p_t$  and  $S_t^j$  in  $\zeta = \xi + i\eta$ , where  $\xi \in D$  and  $|\eta| \leq C$ . The almost analytic extension of  $\phi_t^0$  is given by

$$\phi_t^0(x, \xi + i\eta) = L_t(\xi + i\eta) + R_t(x, \xi + i\eta)$$

where

$$L_t(\xi + i\eta) = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq M} \partial_\xi^\alpha L_t(\xi) (i\eta)^\alpha (\alpha!)^{-1} \text{ and } R_t(x, \xi + i\eta) = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq M} \partial_\xi^\alpha R_t(x, \xi) (i\eta)^\alpha (\alpha!)^{-1}.$$

It is easy to see that

$$\partial_\zeta \phi_t^0(x, \xi + i\eta) = O(|\eta|^M).$$

Moreover,

$$\partial_\zeta^\alpha \bar{\partial}_\zeta^\beta R_t(x, \xi + i\eta) = O_M(|\xi - E_t^\kappa|^M), \quad |\eta| \leq C, \quad (7.117)$$

for  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^{n-1}$  since  $R_t$  is flat at  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times E_t^\kappa$ . In the same way we obtain almost analytic extensions  $S_t(\varphi, \zeta, \lambda)$  of  $S_t^j$  and  $p_t^j(\zeta)$  of  $p_t^j$ ,  $\zeta := \xi + i\eta$ , such that

$$\bar{\partial}_\zeta p_t^j(\xi + i\eta) = O(|\eta|^M), \quad \partial_\xi^\alpha \partial_\eta^\beta \bar{\partial}_\zeta S_t^j(x, \xi + i\eta) = O_{\alpha, \beta}(|\eta|^{M-|\beta|}), \quad (7.118)$$

for  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^{n-1}$ ,  $|\beta| \leq M$ . Moreover,

$$\partial_\xi^\alpha \partial_\eta^\beta S_t^j(\varphi, \xi + i\eta) = O(|\xi - E_t^\kappa|^N), \quad (7.119)$$

for  $|\eta| \leq C$ , and  $\text{supp}_\zeta S_t^j \subset K$ ,  $\text{supp } p_t^j \subset K$  for  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , where  $K$  is a fixed compact subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ . We have as well  $p_t^0(\xi + i\eta) = 1$  whenever  $\xi \in D^0$ .

**Proposition 7.15** *For each  $t \in J$  we have*

$$\begin{aligned} W_t^0(\lambda) e_k(\varphi) &= \exp \left( -i\lambda \phi_t^0(\varphi, (k + \vartheta_0/4)\lambda^{-1}) \right) \\ &\times \left( \sum_{j=0}^N p_t^j((k + \vartheta_0/4)\lambda^{-1}) \lambda^{-j} \right) e_k(\varphi) + O_N(|\lambda|^{-N-1}) e_k(\varphi) \end{aligned} \quad (7.120)$$

and

$$S_t(\lambda)e_k(\varphi) = O_N(|\lambda|^{-N-1} + |E_t^\kappa - (k + \vartheta/4)\lambda^{-1}|^{N+1})e_k(\varphi) \quad (7.121)$$

where  $\lambda \in \mathcal{D}$  and  $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$ .

*Proof.* The proof of the proposition is close to that of Proposition 3.11, [56] but we give it for the sake of completeness. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{W_t^0(\lambda)e_k(x)} &= \widetilde{e_k(x)} e^{-i\lambda\phi_t^0(x, \xi_k)} \\ &\times \lambda^{-j} \left(\frac{\lambda}{2\pi}\right)^{n-1} \sum_{j=0}^N \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n-2}} e^{i\lambda\langle x-y+w_t(x, \xi_k, \eta_k), \eta_k \rangle} p_t^j(I) dI dy + O_N(|\lambda|^{-N-1}) \widetilde{e_k(x)}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\lambda \in \mathcal{D}$  and

$$w_t(x, \xi, \eta) = \int_0^1 \nabla_\xi \phi_t^0(x, \xi + \tau\eta) d\tau, \quad \xi_k = (k + \vartheta_0/4)/\lambda, \quad \eta_k = I - (k + \vartheta_0/4)/\lambda.$$

If  $|k| \geq C_0|\lambda|$  and  $C_0 \gg 1$  ( $C_0$  depends only on the compact set  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  such that  $\text{supp } p_t^j \subset K$  for every  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ ) then  $|\eta_k| \geq 1$  and we can integrate by parts with respect to  $y$  gaining  $O_N(|\lambda|^{-N-1})$ . Suppose now that  $|k| \leq C_0|\lambda|$ . We have

$$|\text{Im}((k + \vartheta_0/4)/\lambda)| \leq \frac{C}{|\lambda|} \quad \text{for } |k| \leq C_0|\lambda| \text{ and } \lambda \in \mathcal{D}. \quad (7.122)$$

Then deforming the contour of integration we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} W_t^0(\lambda)e_k(\varphi) &= e_k(\varphi) e^{-i\lambda\phi_t^0(\varphi, (k+\vartheta_0/4)/\lambda)} \\ &\times \sum_{j=0}^N \lambda^{-j} \left(\frac{\lambda}{2\pi}\right)^{n-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n-2}} e^{-i\lambda\langle u, v \rangle} p_t^j(v + (k + \vartheta_0/4)/\lambda) du dv + O_N(|\lambda|^{-N-1})e_k(\varphi), \end{aligned}$$

which implies (7.120).

To prove (7.121) we write  $\widetilde{S_t(\lambda)e_k(x)}$  as an oscillatory integral as above, and then for  $|k| \leq C_0|\lambda|$  we change the contour of integration with respect to  $y$  by

$$y \rightarrow v = y - x - w_t(x, (k + \vartheta_0/4)/\lambda, I - (k + \vartheta_0/4)/\lambda)$$

while for  $|k| \geq C_0|\lambda|$  we integrate by parts to gain  $O_N(|\lambda|^{-N-1})$ . This implies, using (7.122), that

$$\begin{aligned} S_t(\lambda)e_k(\varphi) &= e_k(\varphi) e^{-i\lambda\phi_t^0(\varphi, (k+\vartheta_0/4)/\lambda)} \\ &\times \sum_{j=0}^N \left(\frac{\lambda}{2\pi}\right)^{n-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n-2}} e^{-i\lambda\langle v, I - (k+\vartheta_0/4)/\lambda \rangle} S_t^j(\varphi, I) \lambda^{-j} dI dv + O_N(|\lambda|^{-N-1})e_k(\varphi). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $M > 2N + n + 2$ , taking the Taylor expansion of order  $N$  of the function

$$[0, 1] \ni s \rightarrow \psi(s) := S_t^j(\varphi, (k + \vartheta_0/4)/\lambda) + s(I - (k + \vartheta_0/4)/\lambda)$$

at  $s = 0$  with an integral reminder and using (7.118) and (7.122) we get

$$S_t^j(\varphi, I) = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq N} \partial_\zeta^\alpha S_t^j(\varphi, (k + \vartheta_0/4)/\lambda) (I - (k + \vartheta_0/4)/\lambda)^\alpha / \alpha! + T_N(\varphi, I) + O(|\lambda|^{-N-n-1})$$

where the reminder term is

$$T_N(\varphi, I) := (N+1) \sum_{|\alpha|=N+1} \int_0^1 (1-s)^N \partial_I^\alpha S_t^j(\varphi, I + s(k + \vartheta_0/4)/\lambda) (I - (k + \vartheta_0/4)/\lambda)^\alpha / \alpha! ds.$$

We have

$$\partial_\zeta^\alpha S_t^j(\varphi, (k + \vartheta_0/4)/\lambda) = O_{N,\alpha,\beta} (|E_t^\kappa - (k + \vartheta_0/4)\lambda^{-1}|^{N+1}), \quad \lambda \in \mathcal{D},$$

for every  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{n-1}$  in view of (7.119).

To estimate the reminder we integrate  $N+1$  times by parts with respect to  $v$  in the corresponding oscillatory integral with amplitude

$$(N+1) \sum_{|\alpha|=N+1} \int_0^1 (1-s)^N \partial_I^\alpha S_t^j(\varphi, I + s(k + \vartheta_0/4)/\lambda) (I - (k + \vartheta_0/4)/\lambda)^\alpha / \alpha! ds$$

and we estimate it by  $C_N |\lambda|^{-N-1}$ . This implies (7.121).  $\square$

Proposition 7.15 suggests that we should look for pairs  $(\lambda, k) \in \mathcal{D} \times \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$  such that  $|\lambda| \gg 1$  and

$$|E_t^\kappa - (k + \vartheta_0/4)\lambda^{-1}| \leq \frac{C}{|\lambda|} \quad (7.123)$$

where  $C > 0$  is a constant. Then (7.120) and (7.121) imply

$$\begin{aligned} W_t^0(\lambda) e_k(\varphi) &= \exp \left( -i\lambda L_t((k + \vartheta_0/4)\lambda^{-1}) \right) \\ &\times \left( \sum_{j=0}^N p_t^j((k + \vartheta_0/4)\lambda^{-1}) \lambda^{-j} \right) e_k(\varphi) + O_N(|\lambda|^{-N-1}) e_k(\varphi) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$S_t(\lambda) e_k(\varphi) = O_N(|\lambda|^{-N-1}) e_k(\varphi)$$

Thus taking  $e = e_k$  in (7.116) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\exp \left( -i\lambda L_t((k + \vartheta_0/4)\lambda^{-1}) + i\pi\vartheta/2 \right) \left( \sum_{j=0}^N p_t^j((k + \vartheta_0/4)\lambda^{-1}) \lambda^{-j} \right) e_k(\varphi) \\ &= O_N(|\lambda|^{-N-1}) e_k(\varphi) \end{aligned}$$

for every  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ . Recall that  $p_t^0(\xi + i\eta) = 1$  if  $\xi \in D^0$ . Then for  $|\lambda| \gg 1$  and  $t \in J$  we can write the above equation as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda L_t \left( \frac{k + \vartheta_0/4}{\lambda} \right) &= 2\pi k_n \pi + \pi\vartheta/2 \\ &+ \frac{1}{i} \text{Log} \left( 1 + \sum_{j=1}^N p_t^j \left( \frac{k + \vartheta_0/4}{\lambda} \right) \lambda^{-j} \right) + O_N(|\lambda|^{-N-1}) \end{aligned} \quad (7.124)$$

where  $k_n \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $\text{Log } z = \ln |z| + i \arg z$ ,  $-\pi < \arg z < \pi$ .

Hence, to construct quasi-modes we have to find pairs  $(\lambda, k)$  satisfying both (7.123) and (7.124).

## 8 $C^1$ families of quasi-modes and iso-spectral invariants

Given  $t \in J$  and  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$  the formulas (7.123) and (7.124) suggest that the quantization condition of the Lagrangian torus  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$  should be of the form

$$\left| \lambda I_t(\omega) - (k + \vartheta_0/4) \right| + \left| \lambda L_t \left( \frac{k + \vartheta_0/4}{\lambda} \right) - 2\pi k_n \pi - \pi \vartheta/2 \right| \leq C$$

for some  $C > 0$ , where  $I_t(\omega) \in E_t^\kappa$  is the corresponding action on the torus  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$ ,  $(k, k_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$  and  $\lambda \in \mathcal{D}$ . To obtain iso-spectral invariants from  $C^1$ -families of quasi-modes we need a stronger quantization condition which will be formulated below.

### 8.1 Quantization condition

Fix  $t \in J$ . The quantization condition corresponding to a Lagrangian torus  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$  with a frequency  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$  will be given by means the following Lemma.

**Lemma 8.1** *Given  $t \in J$  there is a set  $\Xi_\kappa^t \subset \Omega_\kappa^0$  of full Lebesgue measure in  $\Omega_\kappa^0$  such that the following holds.*

*For any  $\omega \in \Xi_\kappa^t$  there is an infinite sequence  $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\omega)$  of  $(q, \lambda) \in \mathbb{Z}^n \times [1, \infty)$  such that*

$$q = (k, k_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{Z}, \quad \lambda = \mu_q^0 \geq 1 \quad \text{satisfies} \quad c_0^{-1}|q| \leq \mu_q^0 \leq c_0|q| \quad \text{with } c_0 > 0, \quad (8.125)$$

*and*

$$\lim_{|q| \rightarrow \infty} \left| \mu_q^0 \left( I_t(\omega), L_t(I_t(\omega)) \right) - \left( k + \frac{\vartheta_0}{4}, 2\pi \left( k_n + \frac{\vartheta}{4} \right) \right) \right| = 0. \quad (8.126)$$

*Proof.* Denote by  $\Xi_\kappa^t$  the set of all  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$  such that

$$2\pi k_n I_t(\omega) \neq L_t(I_t(\omega))k \quad \text{for each } 0 \neq (k, k_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{Z}. \quad (8.127)$$

We claim that the complement  $\Omega_\kappa^0 \setminus \Xi_\kappa^t$  of  $\Xi_\kappa^t$  in  $\Omega_\kappa^0$  is of Lebesgue measure zero. Suppose the contrary. Then there is  $0 \neq (k, k_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{Z}$  and a set of positive Lebesgue measure  $R_t \subset \Omega_\kappa^0$  such that

$$2\pi k_n I_t(\omega) = L_t(I_t(\omega))k \quad \forall \omega \in R_t.$$

On the other hand, the map  $\Omega \ni \omega \rightarrow I_t(\omega) = \nabla L_t^*(\omega) \in D$  is a local diffeomorphism with inverse  $I \rightarrow \nabla L_t(I)$  by 4, Theorem 6.1, hence, the set  $R_t^0 := \{I_t(\omega) : \omega \in R_t\}$  is of positive Lebesgue measure in  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ . Moreover,

$$2\pi k_n I = L_t(I)k \quad \forall I \in R_t^0 \quad (8.128)$$

and  $R_t := \{\nabla L_t(I) : I \in R_t^0\}$  by definition. Let  $I^0 \in R_t^0$  be a point of positive Lebesgue density in  $R_t^0$ . Set  $\omega^0 = (\omega_1^0, \dots, \omega_{n-1}^0) := \nabla L_t(I^0) \in \Omega_\kappa^0$ . Differentiating (8.128) with respect to  $I$  at  $I^0$  and using Lemma 6.3 we get  $2\pi k_n = k_j \omega_j^0$ , for  $j = 1, \dots, n-1$ , which contradicts (1.2). Hence,

the Lebesgue measure of  $\Omega_\kappa^0 \setminus \Xi_\kappa^t$  is zero. On the other hand, (8.127) implies that for any  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$  the trajectory

$$\{\lambda(I_t(\omega), L_t(I_t(\omega))) \pmod{\mathbb{Z}^n} : \lambda \geq 1\} \subset \mathbb{R}^n/\mathbb{Z}^n$$

is not periodic, hence, it is dense on the torus  $\mathbb{R}^n/\mathbb{Z}^n$  which implies that there exists an infinite sequence  $(q_j, \lambda_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  satisfying (8.126). The inequality in (8.125) follows from (8.126) since the continuous function

$$\omega \mapsto \|(I_t(\omega), L_t(I_t(\omega)))\| = \|(\nabla L_t^*(\omega), L_t(\nabla L_t^*(\omega)))\|$$

does not vanish on the compact set  $\Omega_\kappa^0$  in view of (1.5) and (1.9).  $\square$

We point out that the set  $\Xi_\kappa^t$  and the sequence  $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\omega)$  may depend on  $t$ .

From now on we fix  $\omega$  in the set  $\Xi_\kappa^t$  given by Lemma 8.1 and denote by  $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$  the image of the projection of  $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\omega) \subset \mathbb{Z}^n \times [1, \infty)$  on the first factor.  $\mathcal{M}$  will be the index set of the  $C^1$  family of quasi-modes that we are going to construct and (8.126) - the quantization condition for  $s = t$ . To obtain a quantization condition for the tori  $\Lambda_s(\omega)$  for  $s$  close to  $t$  we consider for any  $q \in \mathcal{M}$  the interval

$$J_q := [t, t + 2|q|^{-1}].$$

Getting rid of finitely many elements  $q \in \mathcal{M}$  we suppose that  $J_q$  is contained in  $J \subset [0, \delta]$  for every  $q \in \mathcal{M}$ . Recall from Theorem 6.1 that the maps  $s \mapsto L_s \in C^\infty(D)$  and  $s \mapsto I_s \in C^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{n-1})$  are  $C^1$  on the interval  $J$ . Then using (8.125) and (8.126) we obtain that there exists a constant  $C = C(\omega) > 0$  independent of  $q \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $s \in J_q$  such that

$$\left| \mu_q^0(I_s(\omega), L_s(I_s(\omega))) - \left( k + \frac{\vartheta_0}{4}, 2\pi \left( k_n + \frac{\vartheta}{4} \right) \right) \right| \leq C \quad \forall q \in \mathcal{M}, s \in J_q. \quad (8.129)$$

The quantization condition (8.129) will be used below to construct a  $C^1$  quasi-mode with an index set  $\mathcal{M}$  for  $s \in J_q$ ,  $q \in \mathcal{M}$ . Condition (8.126) is not needed for the construction of the quasi-mode, but it is essential for the proof of Lemma 8.4 below.

## 8.2 Construction of $C^1$ families of quasi-modes

Fix a positive integer  $M \geq 0$ . For any  $q \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $|q| \geq q_0 \gg 1$  we are going to construct a family of quasi-modes of order  $M$  depending on  $s \in J_q$  such that the corresponding family of quasi-eigenvalues  $s \mapsto \mu_q(s)^2$  belongs to  $C^1(J_q)$ .

**Theorem 8.2** *For every  $q = (k, k_n) \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $s \in J_q$  there exists a quasi-mode  $(\mu_q(s)^2, u_{s,q})$  of  $\Delta_s$  of order  $M$  such that*

$$(i) \quad u_{s,q} \in D(\Delta_s) \text{ and } \|u_{s,q}\|_{L^2(X)} = 1;$$

$$(ii) \quad \text{There exists a constant } C_M > 0 \text{ such that}$$

$$\begin{cases} \|\Delta u_{s,q} - \mu_q^2(s) u_{s,q}\| \leq C_M \mu_q^{-M}(s) & \text{in } L^2(X), \\ \mathcal{B} u_{s,q}|_\Gamma = 0 \end{cases} \quad (8.130)$$

for every  $q \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $s \in J_q$ ;

(iii) We have

$$\mu_q(s) = \mu_q^0 + c_{q,0}(s) + c_{q,1}(s) \frac{1}{\mu_q^0} + \cdots + c_{q,M}(s) \frac{1}{(\mu_q^0)^M}, \quad \text{where}$$

(iv) The functions  $s \mapsto c_{q,j}(s)$  are real valued and  $C^1$  on the interval  $J_q$ ;

(v) There exists a constant  $C'_M > 0$  such that  $|c_{q,j}(s)| \leq C'_M$  for every  $q \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $0 \leq j \leq M$ , and any  $s \in J_q$ ;

(vi) There exists  $C > 0$  such that

$$\left| \mu_q(s) L_s \left( \frac{k + \vartheta_0/4}{\mu_q(s)} \right) - 2\pi \left( k_n + \frac{\vartheta}{4} \right) \right| \leq \frac{C}{\mu_q(s)}$$

for every  $q \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $s \in J_q$ ;

(vii) We have

$$\frac{k + \vartheta_0/4}{\mu_q(t)} = I_t(\omega) + o\left(\frac{1}{|q|}\right) \quad \text{as } |q| \rightarrow \infty.$$

*Proof.* We are looking for a perturbation  $\lambda = \mu_q(s)$  of  $\mu_q^0$  satisfying (7.124) which means that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_q(s) L_s \left( \frac{k + \vartheta_0/4}{\mu_q(s)} \right) - \frac{1}{i} \text{Log} \left( 1 + \sum_{j=1}^M p_s \left( \frac{k + \vartheta_0/4}{\mu_q(s)} \right) \mu_q(s)^{-j} \right) \\ = 2\pi \left( k_n + \frac{\vartheta}{4} \right) + O_M \left( \frac{1}{(\mu_q^0)^{M+1}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

uniformly with respect to  $q \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $s \in J_q$ . Introducing a small parameter  $\varepsilon_q = (\mu_q^0)^{-1}$  we are looking for

$$\begin{cases} \mu_q(s) &= \mu_q^0 + c_{q,0}(s) + c_{q,1}(s)\varepsilon_q + \cdots c_{q,M}(s)\varepsilon_q^M, \\ \zeta_q(s) &= I_s^0(\omega) + b_{q,0}(s)\varepsilon_q + \cdots b_{q,M}(s)\varepsilon_q^{M+1}(s) + b_{q,M+1}(s)\varepsilon_q^{M+2} \end{cases} \quad (8.131)$$

such that

$$\begin{cases} \mu_q(s) \zeta_q(s) &= k + \frac{\vartheta_0}{4} \\ \mu_q(s) L_s(\zeta_q(s)) &= 2\pi \left( k_n + \frac{\vartheta}{4} \right) + \frac{1}{i} \text{Log} \left( 1 + \sum_{j=1}^M p_s^j(\zeta_q(s)) \mu_q(s)^{-j} \right) + O_M(\varepsilon_q^{M+1}). \end{cases} \quad (8.132)$$

We are going to find  $\mu_q(s)$ . Using (8.131) we write

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_q(s) \zeta_q(s) - k - \vartheta_0/4 &= \sum_{j=0}^M \varepsilon_q^j [b_{q,j}(s) + c_{q,j}(s) I_s(\omega) - W_{q,j}(s)] \\ &+ \varepsilon_q^{M+1} [(\varepsilon_q \mu_q) b_{q,M+1}(s) - W_{q,M+1}(s)], \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} W_{q,0}(s) = k + \vartheta_0/4 - \mu_q^0 I_s(\omega), \\ W_{q,j}(s) = - \sum_{r+s=j-1} c_{q,r}(s) b_{q,s}(s) \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq M, \text{ and} \\ W_{q,M+1}(s) = - \sum_{l=0}^M \sum_{r=M-l}^M c_{q,r}(s) b_{q,l}(s). \end{array} \right. \quad (8.133)$$

Expanding  $L_s(\zeta_q(s))$  and  $p_s^j(\zeta_q(s))$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq M$ , in Taylor series at  $\zeta = I_s(\omega)$  up to order  $M$  we obtain from (8.132) the following linear systems

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} b_{q,j}(s) + c_{q,j}(s) I_s(\omega) = W_{q,j}(s) \\ L_s(I_s(\omega)) c_{q,j}(s) + \langle \omega, b_{q,j}(s) \rangle = V_{q,j}(s), \end{array} \right.$$

for  $0 \leq j \leq M$ , and we put  $b_{q,M+1}(s) = (\varepsilon_q \mu_q)^{-1} W_{q,M+1}(s)$ , where  $W_{q,j}(s)$  is given by (8.133), and  $V_{q,j}(s)$  is a polynomial of  $c_{q,r}(s)$  and  $b_{q,r'}(s)$  with  $0 \leq r, r' \leq j-1$  and with  $C^1$  with respect to  $s$  coefficients. By (1.5) and (1.9) the corresponding determinant is

$$D(I_s(\omega)) := L_s(I_s(\omega)) - \langle I_s(\omega), \omega \rangle = -\beta_s(\omega) = 2 \int_{\Lambda_s(\omega)} A_s(\rho) d\mu_s > 0$$

and we obtain a unique solution  $(c_{q,j}(s), b_{q,j}(s))$ ,  $0 \leq j \leq M-1$ . More precisely,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} c_{q,j}(s) = D(I_s(\omega))^{-1} [V_{q,j}(s) - 2\pi \langle \omega, W_{q,j}(s) \rangle] \\ b_{q,j}(s) = W_{q,j}(s) - c_{q,j}(s) I_s(\omega). \end{array} \right. \quad (8.134)$$

We have

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} W_{q,0}(s) = k + \vartheta_0/4 - \mu_q^0 I_s(\omega) = O(1), \\ V_{q,0}(s) = 2\pi k_n - \pi \vartheta/2 - \mu_q^0 L_s(I_s(\omega)) = O(1), \quad q \in \mathcal{M}, \end{array} \right. \quad (8.135)$$

uniformly with respect to  $q \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $s \in J_q$ , in view of (8.129). Hence,  $b_{q,0}(s)$  and  $c_{q,0}(s)$ ,  $q \in \mathcal{M}$ , are  $C^1$  in  $J_q$  and uniformly bounded. By recurrence we prove that  $b_{q,j}(s)$  and  $c_{q,j}(s)$ ,  $q \in \mathcal{M}$ , are  $C^1$  in  $J_q$  and uniformly bounded with respect to  $q \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $s \in J_q$ . To evaluate  $b_{q,M+1}(s)$  observe that  $\varepsilon_q \mu_q = 1 + O(\varepsilon_q)$ .

For such  $\mu_q(s)$  the quantization condition (8.129) gives the estimate

$$\frac{k + \vartheta_0/4}{\mu_q(s)} = \zeta_q(s) = I_s(\omega) + O(\mu_q(s)^{-1})$$

uniformly with respect to  $s \in J_q$ . Then Proposition 7.15 for  $N = M$  implies that  $(\lambda = \mu_q(s), e_k)$  satisfy (7.116) and we obtain that

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \|\Delta u_{s,q} - \mu_q^2(s) u_{s,q}\| \leq C_M \mu_q^{-M}(s) \quad \text{in } L^2(X), \\ \|\mathcal{B} u_{s,q}\| \leq C_M \mu_q^{-M}(s) \quad \text{in } L^2(\Gamma). \end{array} \right.$$

In order to prove the property (i) and to satisfy the boundary conditions in (ii) exactly we follow the proof given in [56], Sect. 3.6.3, using Proposition 7.7. The property (vi) follows from the second equation of (8.132). To prove (vii) observe that

$$\begin{cases} W_{q,0}(t) = k + \vartheta_0/4 - \mu_q^0 I_t(\omega) = o(1) \\ V_{q,0}(t) = 2\pi k_n - \pi \vartheta/2 - \mu_q^0 L_t(I_t(\omega)) = o(1) \end{cases}$$

as  $|q| \rightarrow \infty$  in view of (8.126). Then (8.134) implies that  $c_{q,0}(t) = o(1)$  and  $b_{q,0}(t) = o(1)$  and we obtain

$$\frac{k + \vartheta_0/4}{\mu_q(t)} = \zeta_t(\omega) = I_t(\omega) + b_{q,0}(t)\varepsilon_q + O(\varepsilon_q^2) = I_t(\omega) + o\left(\frac{1}{|q|}\right) \quad \text{as } |q| \rightarrow \infty.$$

This completes the proof of the Theorem.  $\square$

### 8.3 From quasi-modes to isospectral invariants

We are going to complete the proof of Theorem 1. The items (i) and (ii) have been proven in Sect. 6. We are going to prove item (iii) which states that the functions  $\beta_t(\omega)$ ,  $I_t(\omega)$  and  $\alpha_t(I_t(\omega)) = L_t(I_t(\omega))$  are independent of  $t \in [0, \delta]$  for any  $\omega \in \Xi$  provided that the billiard tables satisfy the weak isospectral condition  $(H_1) - (H_2)$ . Recall that the set  $\Xi$  is of the form (6.59), hence, it suffices to prove the statement for each  $\omega$  in  $\Omega_\kappa^0 \subset \Xi$ .

Given  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  we say that a family of functions  $f_q : J_q \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ ,  $q \in \mathcal{M}$ , is  $o(|q|^\alpha)$  as  $q \rightarrow \infty$  uniformly with respect to  $s$  in  $J_q$  if

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \left( |q|^{-\alpha} \sup_{s \in J_q} |f_q(s)| \right) = 0.$$

We say that “ $f_q = O(|q|^\alpha)$  uniformly with respect to  $s$  in  $J_q$ ” if there is  $C > 0$  such that  $|q|^{-\alpha} |f_q(s)| \leq C$  for any  $q \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $s \in J_q$ . The isospectral condition implies

**Lemma 8.3** *Suppose that  $(H_1) - (H_2)$  holds. Fix an integer  $M > 2d \geq 0$ . Then*

$$\mu_q(s) - \mu_q(t) = o(1) \quad \text{as } q \rightarrow \infty$$

and

$$\mu_q(s) = \mu_q(t) \left( 1 + o\left(\frac{1}{|q|}\right) \right) \quad \text{as } q \rightarrow \infty$$

uniformly with respect to  $s \in J_q$ .

*Proof.* It is easy to see that for any  $q \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $s \in J_q$ , the distance from  $\mu_q(s)^2$  to the spectrum of  $\Delta_s$  can be estimated above by

$$d_{s,q} := |\text{Spec}(\Delta_s) - \mu_q(s)^2| \leq C_M \mu_q(s)^{-M}.$$

Indeed, if  $d_{s,q} \neq 0$  the spectral theorem and (8.130) yield

$$\frac{1}{d_{s,q}} \geq \|(\Delta_s - \mu_q(s)^2)^{-1}\| \geq \|(\Delta_s - \mu_q(s)^2)u_{s,q}\|^{-1} \geq \frac{\mu_q(s)^M}{C_M}.$$

Then Theorem 8.2 and (8.125) imply that for any  $q \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $|q| \geq q_0 \gg 1$ , and  $s \in J_q$  there is  $\lambda_{s,q} \in \text{Spec}(\Delta_s)$  such that  $\lambda_{s,q} \geq \mu_q(s)^2/4 \geq (2c_0)^{-2}|q|^2$  and

$$|\lambda_{s,q} - \mu_q(s)^2| \leq C' \lambda_{s,q}^{-M/2} \quad (8.136)$$

where  $C' = 2^M C_M$ . Now using (H<sub>2</sub>) we get for any  $q \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $|q| \geq q_0 \gg 1$  and  $s \in J_q$  an integer  $k = k(s, q) \geq 1$  such that

$$\lambda_{s,q} \in [a_k, b_k]. \quad (8.137)$$

Fix  $\gamma$  so that  $M > 2\gamma > 2d \geq 0$ . Then choosing  $q_0$  sufficiently large we obtain from (8.136) and (8.137) that for any  $q \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $|q| \geq q_0$  and  $s \in J_q$  the quasi-eigenvalue  $\mu_q(s)^2$  belongs to the interval

$$I_k := \left[ a_k - \frac{c}{2} a_k^{-\gamma}, b_k + \frac{c}{2} a_k^{-\gamma} \right], \quad (8.138)$$

where  $k = k(s, q)$  and  $c > 0$  is the constant of the third assumption of (H<sub>1</sub>). In particular,

$$b_{k(q,s)} \geq \mu_q(t)^2 - \frac{c}{2} a_{k(s,q)}^{-\gamma} \geq C_1 |q|^2 - C_2,$$

for some positive constants  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ , which implies that  $\lim k(s, q) = \infty$  as  $q \rightarrow \infty$  *uniformly* with respect to  $s \in J_q$ . On the other hand, using the third assumption of (H<sub>1</sub>), the relation  $b_k = a_k(1 + o(1))$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , which follows from the first two assumptions in (H<sub>1</sub>), and the inequality  $\gamma > d$ , we get

$$(a_{k+1} - \frac{c}{2} a_{k+1}^{-\gamma}) - (b_k + \frac{c}{2} a_k^{-\gamma}) = (a_{k+1} - b_k) - \frac{c}{2} a_{k+1}^{-\gamma} - \frac{c}{2} a_k^{-\gamma} \geq c b_k^{-d} - c a_k^{-\gamma} > 0$$

for any  $k \geq k_0$ , where  $k_0 \gg 1$ . This shows that the intervals  $I_k$  in (8.138) do not intersect each other for  $k \geq k_0$ . Choose  $q_0 \gg 1$  so that  $k(s, q) \geq k_0$  for any  $q \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $|q| \geq q_0$  and  $s \in J_q$  (recall that  $k(s, q) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $|q| \rightarrow \infty$  uniformly with respect to  $s \in J_q$ ). The function  $\mu_q(s)^2$  is continuous on  $J_q$  (even  $C^1$ ), hence, it can not jump from one interval to another when  $|q| \geq q_0$ . Consequently,  $k(s, q)$  does not depend on  $s$  for  $|q| \geq q_0$ . We have proved that for any  $q \in \mathcal{M}$  such that  $|q| \geq q_0$  there is  $k = k(q) \in \mathbb{N}$  independent of  $s$  such that

$$\mu_q(s)^2 \in \left[ a_k - \frac{c}{2} a_k^{-\gamma}, b_k + \frac{c}{2} a_k^{-\gamma} \right] \quad \forall s \in J_q. \quad (8.139)$$

Moreover,  $k(q) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $q \rightarrow \infty$  and we obtain

$$\mu_q(s)^2 \geq a_{k(q)} - \frac{c}{2} a_k^{-\gamma} \geq \frac{1}{4} a_{k(q)}$$

for  $|q| \geq q_0 \gg 1$  and  $s \in J_q$ . Thus for  $|q| \geq q_0 \gg 1$  we obtain

$$|\mu_q(s) - \mu_q(t)| < \mu_q(t)^{-1} |\mu_q(s)^2 - \mu_q(t)^2| \leq 2 a_{k(q)}^{-1/2} \left( (b_{k(q)} - a_{k(q)}) + c a_{k(q)}^{-\gamma} \right) := \epsilon_q$$

where  $C > 0$  is independent of  $q$  and of  $s \in J_q$ . Now (H<sub>1</sub>) implies that  $\epsilon_q \rightarrow 0$  as  $q \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence,  $\mu_q(s) - \mu_q(t) = o(1)$  as  $q \rightarrow \infty$  uniformly with respect to  $s \in J_q$ . Moreover,

$$\mu_q(s) = \mu_q(t) \left( 1 + \frac{o(1)}{\mu_q(t)} \right) = \mu_q(t) \left( 1 + o\left( \frac{1}{|q|} \right) \right) \quad \text{as } q \rightarrow \infty$$

uniformly with respect to  $s \in J_q$  since  $\mu_q(t) \geq \mu_q^0/2 \geq (2c_0)^{-1}|q|$  for  $|q| \geq q_0 \gg 1$ .  $\square$

Consider the function  $t \rightarrow \beta_t(\omega) = \langle \omega, I_t(\omega) \rangle - L_t(I_t(\omega))$ .

**Lemma 8.4** *Suppose that  $(H_1) - (H_2)$  holds. Then  $\beta_t(\omega) = \beta_0(\omega)$  for any  $t \in [0, \delta]$  and  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$ .*

*Proof.* We are interested in the variation

$$\dot{\beta}_t(\omega) := \frac{d}{dt}\beta_t(\omega).$$

Fix  $t \in [0, \delta)$  and choose  $\omega$  in the set  $\Xi_\kappa^t$  given by Lemma 8.1. Consider the quasi-mode of order  $N > 2d + 2 \geq 2$  constructed by Theorem 8.2. Now Lemma 8.3 and Theorem 8.2, (vii), imply together that

$$\zeta_q(s) = \frac{k + \vartheta_0/4}{\mu_q(s)} = \frac{k + \vartheta_0/4}{\mu_q(t)(1 + o(1/|q|))} = \frac{k + \vartheta_0/4}{\mu_q(t)} + o\left(\frac{1}{|q|}\right) = I_t(\omega) + o\left(\frac{1}{|q|}\right) \quad (8.140)$$

as  $|q| \rightarrow \infty$  and uniformly with respect to  $s \in J_q$ . On the other hand Theorem 8.2, (vi), yields

$$L_s(\zeta_q(s)) = 2\pi \frac{k_n - \vartheta/4}{\mu_q(s)} + O(|q|^{-2})$$

uniformly with respect to  $s \in J_q$  and using Lemma 8.3 we obtain as in (8.140) that

$$L_s(\zeta_q(s)) = L_t(\zeta_q(t)) + o\left(\frac{1}{|q|}\right) \quad \text{as } q \rightarrow \infty \quad (8.141)$$

uniformly with respect to  $s \in J_q$ . Then setting  $\eta := 1/|q| \rightarrow 0$  we obtain by (8.140) and (8.141) the equality

$$\begin{aligned} L_{t+\eta}(I_t(\omega)) &= L_{t+\eta}(\zeta_q(t+\eta) + o(\eta)) = L_{t+\eta}(\zeta_q(t+\eta)) + o(\eta) \\ &= L_t(\zeta_q(t)) + o(\eta) = L_t(I_t(\omega)) + o(\eta). \end{aligned}$$

We have used also that the map  $[0, \delta] \rightarrow L_s \in C^\infty(D)$  is  $C^1$ . Hence,

$$\dot{L}_t(I_t(\omega)) = \frac{d}{ds}L_s(I_t(\omega))\big|_{s=t} = 0 \quad \forall \omega \in \Xi_\kappa^t. \quad (8.142)$$

On the other hand,  $\Xi_\kappa^t$  is dense in  $\Omega_\kappa^0$  since any point of  $\Omega_\kappa^0$  is of positive Lebesgue density and  $\Omega_\kappa^0 \setminus \Xi_\kappa^t$  has measure zero, and by continuity (the function  $I \rightarrow \dot{L}_t(I)$  is smooth) we get (8.142) for any  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$ . The point  $t$  has been fixed arbitrary in  $[0, \delta)$ , hence, (8.142) holds true for every  $t \in [0, \delta)$  and  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$ . Now differentiating  $\beta_t(\omega)$  with respect to  $t$  we obtain

$$\dot{\beta}_t(\omega) = \langle \omega, \dot{I}_t(\omega) \rangle - \dot{L}_t(I_t(\omega)) - \langle \nabla L_t(I_t(\omega)), \dot{I}_t(\omega) \rangle = 0 \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$$

since  $\nabla L_t(I_t(\omega)) = \omega$ . Hence,  $\beta_t(\omega) = \beta_0(\omega)$  for every  $t \in [0, \delta)$  and  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$ . By continuity we get the last equality for every  $t \in [0, \delta]$  as well.  $\square$

Recall that  $\Omega_\kappa^0$  is a set of points of positive Lebesgue density. Differentiating the equality

$$\langle \omega, I_t(\omega) \rangle - L_t(I_t(\omega)) = \beta_t(\omega) = \beta_0(\omega) = \langle \omega, I_0(\omega) \rangle - L_0(I_0(\omega))$$

with respect to  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$  and using Lemma 6.3 we get  $I_t(\omega) = I_0(\omega)$ . Then plugging it in the expression of  $\beta_t(\omega)$  we obtain  $E_{\kappa,t} = E_{\kappa,0}$  as well as the equality  $L_t(I) = L_0(I)$ ,  $I \in E_{\kappa,0}$ . This completes the proof of Theorem 1.  $\square$

## Part II

# K.A.M. theorems and Birkhoff Normal Forms

## 9 K.A.M. theorems

In this Section we prove K.A.M. theorems and obtain BNF for  $C^k$  smooth families of Hamiltonians  $t \rightarrow H_t$  or exact symplectic maps  $t \rightarrow P_t$ . The main novelty in it can be briefly summarized as follows

- the constant  $\epsilon$  in the smallness condition depends only on the dimension of the configuration space and on the exponent in the Diophantine condition;
- $C^k$  smooth families of invariant tori  $t \rightarrow \Lambda_t(\omega)$  with Diophantine frequencies are obtained;
- $C^k$  smooth with respect to the parameter  $t$  BNF is obtained around the union of  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$ ;
- uniform estimates in suitable Hölder norms are obtained.

In order to formulate the main results we recall the notion of the Legendre transform. Let  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $d \geq 1$ , be an open set. We say that a real valued function  $F \in C^\infty(D, \mathbb{R})$  is *non-degenerate* if

$$\nabla F : D \longrightarrow D^* := \nabla F(D) \text{ is a diffeomorphism.} \quad (9.143)$$

The Legendre transform  $F^*$  of  $F$  is defined by

$$F^*(\xi) := \text{Crit.val.}_{x \in D} \{ \langle x, \xi \rangle - F(x) \}$$

which is equivalent to

$$F(x) + F^*(\xi) = \langle x, \xi \rangle, \text{ where } x \in D \text{ and } \xi = \nabla F(x) \in D^*. \quad (9.144)$$

It is easy to see that  $F^* \in C^\infty(D^*, \mathbb{R})$  and that  $\nabla F^* : D^* \longrightarrow D$  is the inverse to the map (9.143). Moreover,  $D^{**} = D$  and  $F^{**} = F$ .

The real valued function  $F$  defines a non-degenerate (in Kolmogorov sense) completely integrable Hamiltonian in  $\mathbb{T}^d \times D$ . Hereafter,  $\mathbb{T}^d := \mathbb{R}^d / 2\pi\mathbb{Z}^d$ . The corresponding Hamiltonian flow is given by  $(s, \theta, r) \rightarrow (\theta + s\nabla F(r), r)$ . The frequency vector of the restriction of the flow to the invariant torus  $\mathbb{T}^d \times \{r\}$  is  $\omega = \nabla F(r) \in \Omega := D^*$  and the corresponding rotation vector is  $\omega/2\pi$ . We work here with frequency vectors instead of rotation vectors because they are more adapted to the Fourier analysis. One can parameterize the invariant tori by their frequency vectors  $\omega \in \Omega$  since  $F$  is non-degenerate. We are interested below in families of non-degenerate completely integrable Hamiltonians  $F_t$ ,  $t \in [0, \delta]$ , with frequency vectors in a fixed open set

$\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ . To this end we consider a family of non-degenerate functions  $F_t^* \in C^\infty(\Omega)$  and define  $F_t$  as the Legendre transform of  $F_t^*$  in  $D_t := \nabla F_t^*(\Omega)$ . The advantage is that the set of frequency vectors is independent of the parameter  $t$ . In particular, the Diophantine conditions will be the same for all  $t$ . The same discussion holds as well for families of completely integrable exact symplectic maps.

This part is organized as follows. The basic K.A.M. theorem is proved in Sect. 10.

### 9.1 K.A.M. theorems for $C^k$ families of Hamiltonians

Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be an open set,  $k \in \{0, 1\}$ , and  $\delta > 0$ . Consider a  $C^k$  family  $H^{0*}$  of real valued functions

$$[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow H^{0*}(\cdot, t) = H_t^{0*}(\cdot) \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega}, \mathbb{R})$$

satisfying the non-degeneracy condition

$$\nabla H_t^{0*} : \Omega \longrightarrow D_t := \nabla H_t^{0*}(\Omega) \text{ is a diffeomorphism.} \quad (9.145)$$

Hereafter  $\overline{\Omega}$  stands for the closure of  $\Omega$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . The corresponding family  $H^0$  of Legendre transforms

$$[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow H_t^0 = H_t^{0**} \in C^\infty(D_t, \mathbb{R})$$

is  $C^k$  as well and  $H_t^0$  satisfies (9.143) on  $D_t$  for each  $t$ . Consider a  $C^k$  family  $H$  of perturbations

$$[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow H(\cdot, t) = H_t(\cdot) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{A}_t, \mathbb{R})$$

of  $H^0$  where  $\mathbb{A}_t := \mathbb{T}^n \times D_t$ .

Let us introduce the arithmetic conditions on the frequency vectors. Fix  $\kappa > 0$  and  $\tau > n - 1$ , and denote by  $\tilde{D}(\kappa, \tau)$  the set of all  $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^n$  satisfying the  $(\kappa, \tau)$ -Diophantine condition

$$\forall 0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}^n : |\langle \omega, k \rangle| \geq \frac{\kappa}{|k|^\tau}. \quad (9.146)$$

Denote by  $\Omega_\kappa$  the set of all  $(\kappa, \tau)$ -Diophantine vectors  $\omega \in \Omega$  such that the distance from  $\omega$  to the complement  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega$  of  $\Omega$  is  $\geq \kappa$ . We will often use the following notation. Given a set  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\kappa > 0$  we set

$$\begin{cases} \Omega + \kappa &:= \{\omega \in \mathbb{R}^n : \text{dist}(\omega, \Omega) < \kappa\} \\ \Omega - \kappa &:= \{\omega \in \Omega : \text{dist}(\omega, \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega) > \kappa\}. \end{cases} \quad (9.147)$$

Then  $\Omega_\kappa = \tilde{D}(\kappa, \tau) \cap \overline{\Omega - \kappa}$ .

In order to formulate the smallness condition we need the following notations. Firstly we define weighted  $C^\ell$  Hölder norms as in [46]. Given  $\ell \geq 0$ ,  $0 < \kappa \leq 1$ , and a domain  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , we denote the weighted (with respect to the small parameter  $\kappa$ )  $C^\ell$ -norm of  $u \in C^\ell(\mathbb{T}^n \times D, \mathbb{R}^k)$  evaluated at  $\mathbb{T}^n \times D$  by

$$\|u\|_{\ell, \mathbb{T}^n \times D; \kappa} := \|u \circ \sigma_\kappa\|_{C^\ell(\sigma_\kappa^{-1}(\mathbb{T}^n \times D))} \quad (9.148)$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_{C^\ell}$  is the corresponding Hölder norm (see Sect. A.1) and  $\sigma_\kappa : \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$  is the partial dilation  $\sigma_\kappa(\theta, r) := (\theta, \kappa r)$ . If  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  then

$$\|u\|_{\ell, \mathbb{T}^n \times D; \kappa} = \sup_{|\alpha| + |\beta| \leq \ell} \sup_{(\theta, r) \in \mathbb{T}^n \times D} |\partial_\theta^\alpha (\kappa \partial_r)^\beta u(\theta, r)|,$$

where  $|\cdot|$  is the Euclidean norm. In the same way we introduce the norm  $\|u\|_{\ell,D;\kappa}$  for  $u \in C^\ell(D, \mathbb{R}^k)$ . We set as well

$$\|u\|_{\ell,D;\kappa} = \sup_{0 \leq m \leq \ell} \|u\|_{\ell-m,D;\kappa}, \quad (9.149)$$

where  $m$  are integers.

Given  $\ell \geq 1$  and a family of functions  $u := \{u_t \in C^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}) : t \in [0, \delta]\}$  we set

$$S_\ell(u) := \sup_{0 \leq t \leq \delta} (1 + \|u_t\|_{C^1(\Omega)})^{\ell-1} (1 + \|u_t\|_{C^\ell(\Omega)}). \quad (9.150)$$

This expression arises when one evaluates the  $C^\ell$ -norms of a composition of functions the form  $f_t \circ u_t$  with  $u_t = \nabla K_t^{0*}$  (see Appendix, Sect. A.2.2). If  $\Omega$  is *convex* then  $\|u_t\|_{C^\ell(\Omega)} \leq \|u_t\|_{C^\mu(\Omega)}$  for  $0 \leq \ell \leq \mu$  and the function  $\ell \rightarrow S_\ell(u)$  becomes increasing in  $[1, +\infty)$ .

Fix  $0 < \vartheta_0 \leq 1$  such that  $2\tau + \vartheta_0$  is not an integer and set

$$\ell_0 := 2\tau + 2 + \vartheta_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \ell(m) := 2m(\tau + 1) + \ell_0, \quad m \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (9.151)$$

Given  $\varrho, \kappa \in (0, 1)$  and  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  we denote

$$\mathcal{A}_m^0 := \sup_{0 \leq j \leq m} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq \delta} (\varrho^2 \|\partial^2 H_t^0\|_{\ell(j), D_t; \kappa} + \|H_t - H_t^0\|_{\ell(j), \mathbb{A}_t; \kappa}). \quad (9.152)$$

and

$$\mathcal{A}_m = \mathcal{A}_m^0 S_{\ell(m)+1}(\nabla H^{0*}). \quad (9.153)$$

Here  $\partial^2 H_t^0(I)$  is the Hessian matrix of  $H_t^0$  at  $I \in D_t$ . The role of the small parameter  $\varrho$  is to compensate the norm of Hessian matrix which could be very large. The sequence  $\mathcal{A}_m$ ,  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , is *increasing* when  $\Omega$  is convex.

Let  $\Phi_t^s := \exp(sX_{H_t})$ ,  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ , be the flow of the Hamiltonian vector field  $X_{H_t}$  of the Hamiltonian  $H_t$  in  $\mathbb{A}_t = \mathbb{T}^n \times D_t$ . Recall that for any  $\omega \in \Omega$  the map  $R_\omega : \mathbb{T}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n$  stands for the translation  $R_\omega(\varphi) = \varphi + \omega \pmod{2\pi}$ . Fix  $k \in \{0, 1\}$ .

**Theorem 9.1** *There exists  $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, \tau, \vartheta_0) > 0$  depending only on  $n$ ,  $\tau$  and on  $\vartheta_0$  such that the following holds.*

*Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be an open convex bounded set,  $0 < \varrho \leq \kappa \leq 1$  and  $\Omega_\kappa \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $H^{0*}$  be a  $C^k$  family of real-valued functions  $[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow H_t^{0*} \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega}, \mathbb{R})$  satisfying (9.145), and let  $[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow H_t \in C^\infty(\mathbb{A}_t, \mathbb{R})$  be a  $C^k$  family of Hamiltonians such that*

$$\mathcal{A}_0^0 S_{\ell_0}(\nabla H^{0*}) = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq \delta} (\varrho^2 \|\partial^2 H_t^0\|_{\ell_0, D_t; \kappa} + \|H_t - H_t^0\|_{\ell_0, \mathbb{A}_t; \kappa}) S_{\ell_0}(\nabla H^{0*}) \leq \epsilon \varrho \kappa. \quad (9.154)$$

*Then there is a  $C^k$  mapping  $[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow \Psi_t = (\tilde{U}_t, \tilde{V}_t) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^n \times \Omega; \mathbb{T}^n \times D_t)$  such that*

- (i) *for any  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa$ ,  $[0, \delta] \ni s \rightarrow \Lambda_t(\omega) = \Psi_{t,\omega}(\mathbb{T}^n)$  is a  $C^k$  family of Kronecker invariant tori of the Hamiltonian vector fields  $X_{H_t}$  with a frequency vector  $\omega$ , where  $\Psi_{t,\omega} := \Psi_t(\cdot; \omega)$ . Moreover, for any  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa$  and  $s \in \mathbb{R}$  the following diagram is commutative*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{T}^n & \xrightarrow{R_{s\omega}} & \mathbb{T}^n \\ \downarrow \Psi_{t,\omega} & & \downarrow \Psi_{t,\omega} \\ \Lambda_t(\omega) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_t^s} & \Lambda_t(\omega) \end{array}$$

(ii) for any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  the following estimates hold

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_\varphi^\alpha (\kappa \partial_\omega)^\beta (\tilde{U}_t(\varphi; \omega) - \varphi)| &\leq C_m \frac{A_m}{\kappa \varrho} \\ |\partial_\varphi^\alpha (\kappa \partial_\omega)^\beta (\tilde{V}_t(\varphi; \omega) - \nabla H_t^{0*}(\omega))| &\leq C_m \frac{A_m}{\varrho} \left(1 + \frac{A_1}{\varrho}\right)^m \end{aligned} \quad (9.155)$$

for any  $t \in [0, \delta]$ ,  $(\varphi, \omega) \in \mathbb{T}^n \times \Omega$  and multi-indices  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^n$  with  $|\alpha + \beta| \leq m$ , where the constant  $C_m > 0$  depends only on  $n, \tau, \vartheta_0$  and  $m$ .

(iii)  $\text{supp}((\tilde{U}_t, \tilde{V}_t) - (\text{id}, \nabla H_t^{0*})) \subset \mathbb{T}^n \times (\Omega - \kappa/2)$ .

*Proof.* The idea of the proof is given by Pöschel in [47]. It can be summarized as follows. We fix  $\omega \in \Omega$  set  $r = \nabla H_t^{0*}(\omega) + I$  and apply Taylor's formula up to order two to the function  $I \rightarrow H_t^0(\nabla H_t^{0*}(\omega) + I)$  at  $I = 0$ . Then the affine linear with respect to  $I$  term is just  $N_t(I; \omega) = e_t(\omega) + \langle I, \omega \rangle$  and we put the quadratic term in the perturbation. Multiplying the perturbation by suitable cut-off functions we obtain a Hamiltonian  $\tilde{H}_t(\theta, I; \omega) = N(I; \omega) + P_t(\theta, I; \omega)$ , where  $t \rightarrow P_t \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \Omega)$  is  $C^k$  and  $P_t$  are compactly supported with respect to  $(I; \omega)$ . The smallness condition allows us to apply Theorem 10.1. The main difficulty in the proof is to obtain the corresponding estimates in  $C^\ell$ ,  $\ell \geq 0$ . We devide the proof in several steps.

*Step 1. Construction of the Hamiltonian  $\tilde{H}_t(\theta, I; \omega)$ .* Given  $\omega \in \Omega - \kappa/4$  and  $I$  in the ball  $B^n(0, \varrho) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  of center 0 and radius  $\varrho$ , we set  $r = \nabla H_t^{0*}(\omega) + I$ . Choosing  $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, \tau, \vartheta_0) \leq 1/9$  in (9.154) we will show that

$$\forall \omega \in \Omega - \kappa/4, \forall I \in B^n(0, \varrho), \quad \begin{cases} \nabla H_t^{0*}(\omega) + I \in D_t & \text{and} \\ \nabla H_t^0(\nabla H_t^{0*}(\omega) + I) \in \Omega - \frac{1}{8}\kappa. \end{cases} \quad (9.156)$$

Indeed, the smallness condition (9.154) implies that  $\|\partial^2 H_t^0\|_{C^0(D_t)} \leq \epsilon \kappa / \varrho$  since  $S_{\ell_0}(\nabla H^{0*}) > 1$ . Then for any  $\omega \in \Omega - \kappa/4$  there is a positive number  $c \leq \varrho$  such that for any  $I \in B^n(0, c)$  the following relation holds

$$\begin{cases} \nabla H_t^{0*}(\omega) + I \in D_t & \text{and} \\ |\nabla H_t^0(\nabla H_t^{0*}(\omega) + I) - \omega| \leq \|\partial^2 H_t^0\|_{C^0(D_t)} |I| \leq \epsilon \kappa \frac{c}{\varrho} < \frac{\kappa}{9}. \end{cases} \quad (9.157)$$

Using the notations (9.147) one obtains

$$\nabla H_t^0(\nabla H_t^{0*}(\omega) + I) \in (\Omega - \kappa/4) + \kappa/9 = (\Omega - \kappa/8) - \kappa/72.$$

This implies that (9.157) holds for  $c = \varrho$  and for any  $\omega \in \Omega - \kappa/4$  and  $I \in B^n(0, \varrho)$  which proves (9.156). Then Taylor's formula yields

$$H_t^0(r) = e_t(\omega) + \langle I, \omega \rangle + \int_0^1 (1-s) \langle \partial^2 H_t^0(\nabla H_t^{0*}(\omega) + sI) I, I \rangle ds.$$

for  $\omega \in \Omega - \kappa/4$  and  $I \in B^n(0, \varrho)$ , where  $e_t(\omega) := H_t^0(\nabla H_t^{0*}(\omega))$ .

In order to apply Theorem 10.1 we need suitable cut-off functions.

**Lemma 9.2** *For any open set  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$  there exists a smooth cut-off function  $\psi_\varepsilon^U \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n, [0, 1])$  such that  $\psi_\varepsilon^U = 1$  on  $U - \varepsilon$ ,  $\psi_\varepsilon^U = 0$  on the complement of  $U + \varepsilon$ , and*

$$\|\psi_\varepsilon^U\|_{\ell; \varepsilon} \leq C_\ell$$

for any  $\ell \geq 0$ , where the constants  $C_\ell = C(\ell, n)$  depend only on  $\ell$  and  $n$ .

The proof of the Lemma is given in the Appendix, Sect. A.2.1.

Denote by  $\psi_\kappa \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n, [0, 1])$  the function given by Lemma 9.2 with  $U = \Omega - \kappa/2$  and  $\varepsilon = \kappa/4$ . Then  $\psi_\kappa = 1$  on  $\Omega - 3\kappa/4$ ,  $\psi_\kappa = 0$  on the complement of  $\Omega - \kappa/4$ , and

$$\|\psi_\kappa\|_{\ell; \kappa} \leq C_\ell \quad (9.158)$$

for any  $\ell \geq 0$ , where the constants  $C_\ell = C(\ell, n)$  depend only on  $\ell$  and  $n$ . Let  $\tilde{\psi}_\varrho$  be the cut-off function given by Lemma 9.2 with  $U = B^n(0, 3\varrho/4)$  and  $\varepsilon = \varrho/8$ . Then  $\tilde{\psi}_\varrho = 1$  on  $B^n(0, \varrho/2)$ ,  $\tilde{\psi}_\varrho = 0$  outside  $B^n(0, 7\varrho/8)$ , and

$$\|\tilde{\psi}_\varrho\|_{\ell; \varrho} \leq C_\ell \quad (9.159)$$

for any  $\ell \geq 0$ , where the constants  $C_\ell = C(\ell, n)$  depend only on  $\ell$  and  $n$ .

It follows from (9.156) that the function

$$P_t^0(I; \omega) := \int_0^1 (1-s) \langle \partial^2 H_t^0(\nabla H_t^{0*}(\omega) + sI)I, I \rangle \psi_\kappa(\omega) \tilde{\psi}_\varrho(I) ds,$$

is well defined and compactly supported in  $B^n(0, \varrho) \times \Omega$ . Setting

$$P_t^1(\theta, I; \omega) := (H_t - H_t^0)(\theta, \nabla H_t^{0*}(\omega) + I) \psi_\kappa(\omega) \tilde{\psi}_\varrho(I) \quad \text{and} \quad P_t := P_t^0 + P_t^1,$$

we consider the Hamiltonian

$$\tilde{H}_t(\theta, I; \omega) = e_t(\omega) + \langle I, \omega \rangle + P_t(\theta, I; \omega).$$

We have

$$H_t(\theta, \nabla H_t^{0*}(\omega) + I) = \tilde{H}_t(\theta, I; \omega) \quad (9.160)$$

for  $I \in B^n(0, \varrho/2)$  and  $\omega \in \Omega - 3\kappa/4$ .

*Step 2. Hölder estimates of  $P_t$ .* We are going to evaluate the weighted norm

$$\|P_t\|_{\ell; r, \kappa} := \|P_t \circ \sigma_{r, \kappa}\|_{C^\ell(U)}, \quad U := \sigma_{r, \kappa}^{-1}(\mathbb{T}^n \times B^n(0, \varrho) \times \Omega),$$

introduced in (10.201). In order to estimate  $\|P_t^0\|_{\ell; r, \kappa}$  we set  $\Gamma := B^n(0, \varrho) \times (\Omega - 8\kappa/9)$ ,  $\Gamma_t := B^n(0, \varrho) \times D_t$ ,

$$Q_t^1(I, r) = \int_0^1 (1-s) \partial^2 H_t^0(r + sI) ds$$

and  $Q_t^0(I, r) = \langle Q_t^1(I, r)I, I \rangle$  for  $(I, r) \in \Gamma_t$ . Then we write

$$P_t^0(I, \omega) = \psi_\kappa(\omega) \tilde{\psi}_\varrho(I) Q_t^0(I, \nabla H_t^{0*}(\omega)).$$

The function  $Q_t^0 \circ (\text{id}, \nabla H_t^{0*})$  belongs to  $C^\infty(\bar{\Gamma})$ , where  $\Gamma$  is convex. Then using Remark A.6, (9.158) and (9.159) we obtain

$$\|P_t^0\|_{\ell; \varrho, \kappa} \leq C_\ell \|Q_t^0 \circ (\text{id}, \nabla H_t^{0*})\|_{\ell; \varrho, \kappa}.$$

Proposition A.9, 3, and Remark A.10 imply for any  $\ell \geq 1$  the estimate

$$\|Q_t^0 \circ (\text{id}, \nabla H_t^{0*})\|_{\ell; \varrho, \kappa} \leq C_\ell \|Q_t^0\|_{\ell, \Gamma_t; \varrho, \kappa} S_\ell(\nabla H^{0*}).$$

Using (A.12), (9.149) and the inequality  $0 < \varrho \leq \kappa$  we obtain

$$\|Q_t^0\|_{\ell, \Gamma_t; \varrho, \kappa} \leq C_\ell \varrho^2 \|Q_t^1\|_{\ell, \Gamma_t; \varrho, \kappa} \leq C_\ell \varrho^2 \|Q_t^1\|_{\ell, \Gamma_t; \kappa, \kappa} \leq C_\ell \varrho^2 \|\partial^2 H_t^0\|_{\ell, D_t; \kappa}$$

as  $|I| \leq \varrho$  for  $(I, r) \in \Gamma_t$ . This inequality implies

$$\|Q_t^0\|_{\ell, \Gamma_t; \varrho, \kappa} \leq C_\ell \varrho^2 \|\partial^2 H_t^0\|_{\ell, D_t; \kappa}$$

and we obtain

$$\|P_t^0\|_{\ell; \varrho, \kappa} \leq C_\ell \varrho^2 \|\partial^2 H^0\|_{\ell, D_t; \kappa} S_\ell(\nabla H^{0*}).$$

On the other hand  $\|P_t^1\|_{\ell; \varrho, \kappa} \leq \|P_t^1\|_{\ell; \kappa, \kappa}$  since  $0 < \varrho \leq \kappa \leq 1$  and by the same argument we get

$$\|P_t^1\|_{\ell; \varrho, \kappa} \leq C_\ell \|H_t - H_t^0\|_{\ell, \mathbb{A}_t; \kappa} S_\ell(\nabla H^{0*}).$$

Finally we obtain

$$\|P_t\|_{\ell; \varrho, \kappa} \leq C_\ell (\varrho^2 \|\partial^2 H_t^0\|_{\ell, D_t; \kappa} + \|H_t - H_t^0\|_{\ell, \mathbb{A}_t; \kappa}) S_\ell(\nabla H^{0*}). \quad (9.161)$$

*Step 3. Application of Theorem 10.1 .* The estimate (9.154) gives

$$\|P_t\|_{\ell_0; \varrho, \kappa} \leq C \mathcal{A}_0 S_{\ell_0}(\nabla H_t^{0*}) \leq C \epsilon \varrho \kappa. \quad (9.162)$$

This allows us to apply Theorem 10.1 to the Hamiltonian  $(\theta, I) \rightarrow \tilde{H}_t(\theta, I; \omega)$ . Set  $\Psi_t = (\tilde{U}_t, \tilde{V}_t)$ , where  $\tilde{U}_t = U_t$  and  $\tilde{V}_t = (\nabla H_t^{0*}) \circ \phi_t + V_t$ , where  $(U_t, V_t, \phi_t)$  are given by Theorem 10.1. Notice that  $\|V_t\|_{C^0} \leq c\epsilon\varrho$  in view of the estimates in (ii), Theorem 10.1, where the constant  $c$  depends only on  $n, \tau$  and  $\vartheta_0$ , and taking  $\epsilon < \min(1, 1/c)/2$  we obtain  $V_t(\theta; \omega) \in B^n(0, \varrho/2)$  for any  $\theta \in \mathbb{T}^n$  and  $\omega \in \Omega - \kappa$ . In the same way we get  $\phi_t(\omega) \in \Omega - 3\kappa/4$  for  $\omega \in \Omega - \kappa$ . In particular,  $\tilde{\psi}_\varrho(V_t(\theta; \omega)) = 1$  and  $\psi_\kappa(\phi_t(\omega)) = 1$  for any  $(\theta, \omega) \in \mathbb{T}^n \times (\Omega - \kappa)$ .

Now Remark 10.2 and (9.160) imply that for any  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa$  and  $t \in [0, \delta]$  the Lagrangian manifold  $\Lambda_t(\omega) := \Psi_t(\mathbb{T}^n; \omega)$  is a Kronecker invariant torus of  $H_t$  of a frequency vector  $\omega$  satisfying (i) in Theorem 9.1.

*Step 4. Estimates of  $\tilde{U}_t$  and  $\tilde{V}_t$ .* The estimates (ii), Theorem 10.1, imply (ii) in Theorem 9.1 using the estimates of  $\|P_t\|_{\ell; \varrho, \kappa}$  given above. To estimate the derivatives of

$$\tilde{V}_t - \nabla H_t^{0*} = V_t + (\nabla H_t^{0*}) \circ \phi_t - \nabla H_t^{0*}$$

we use (ii), Theorem 10.1 and the following

**Lemma 9.3** *For any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  the following estimate holds*

$$\|(\nabla H_t^{0*}) \circ \phi_t - \nabla H_t^{0*}\|_{m, \Omega; \kappa} \leq C_m \frac{\mathcal{A}_m}{\varrho} \left(1 + \frac{\mathcal{A}_1}{\varrho}\right)^m.$$

*Proof.* The proof of the lemma is based on higher order Hölder estimates of a composition of functions given in the Appendix. We write

$$\nabla H_t^{0*}(\phi_t(\omega)) - \nabla H_t^{0*}(\omega) = u_t(\omega) \cdot v_t(\omega)$$

where

$$u_t(\omega) = \phi_t(\omega) - \omega \in M_{1,n}(\mathbb{R}) \quad \text{and} \quad v_t(\omega) = \int_0^1 (\partial^2 H_t^{0*})(\omega + s(\phi_t(\omega) - \omega)) ds \in M_{n,n}(\mathbb{R}).$$

Theorem 10.1 and (9.161) imply

$$\|\phi_t - \text{id}\|_{m,\Omega;\kappa} \leq C_m \frac{\mathcal{A}_m^0}{\varrho} S_{\ell(m)}(\nabla H^{0*})$$

where

$$S_{\ell(m)}(\nabla H^{0*}) = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq \delta} (1 + \|\nabla H_t^{0*}\|_1)^{\ell(m)-1} (1 + \|\nabla H_t^{0*}\|_{\ell(m)})$$

is increasing with respect to  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  since  $\Omega$  is convex. Moreover, (9.154) yields  $\|\phi_t - \text{id}\|_0 \leq C\varepsilon\kappa$ . Notice that  $v_t$  is well-defined and  $C^\infty$  smooth in the convex set  $\overline{\Omega}$ . Indeed, the image of  $\Omega$  under the map  $\omega \mapsto \omega + s(\phi_t(\omega) - \omega)$  is contained in  $\Omega$  when  $\varepsilon < 1/2C$  since  $\text{supp}(\phi_t - \text{id}) \subset \Omega - \kappa/2$  and  $\|\phi_t - \text{id}\|_0 < \kappa/2$ .

Let  $m = 0$ . Then

$$\|(\nabla H_t^{0*}) \circ \phi_t - \nabla H_t^{0*}\|_{C^0(\Omega)} \leq C_0 \frac{\mathcal{A}_0^0}{\varrho} S_{\ell_0}(\nabla H^{0*}) \|\nabla H_t^{0*}\|_{C^1(\Omega)} < C_0 \frac{\mathcal{A}_0^0}{\varrho} S_{\ell_0+1}(\nabla H^{0*}) = C_0 \frac{\mathcal{A}_0}{\varrho}$$

since  $\Omega$  is convex.

Let  $m \geq 1$ . Using Remark A.6 we get

$$\|\nabla H_t^{0*} \circ \phi_t - \nabla H_t^{0*}\|_{m,\Omega;\kappa} \leq C_m (\|\phi_t - \text{id}\|_{m,\mathbb{R}^n;\kappa} \|v_t\|_{C^0(\Omega)} + \|\phi_t - \text{id}\|_{C^0(\mathbb{R}^n)} \|v_t\|_{m,\Omega;\kappa}).$$

We obtain as above

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi_t - \text{id}\|_{m,\mathbb{R}^n;\kappa} \|v_t\|_{C^0(\Omega)} &\leq C_m \frac{\mathcal{A}_m^0}{\varrho} S_{\ell(m)}(\nabla H^{0*}) \|\nabla H_t^{0*}\|_{C^1(\Omega)} \\ &< C_m \frac{\mathcal{A}_m^0}{\varrho} S_{\ell(m)+1}(\nabla H^{0*}) = C_m \frac{\mathcal{A}_m}{\varrho} \end{aligned}$$

since  $\Omega$  is convex. On the other hand, Proposition A.7, 3, applied to  $f = (\text{id} + s(\phi_t - \text{id})) \circ \sigma_\kappa$  and  $g = \partial^2 H_t^{0*} \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega}, M_{n,n}(\mathbb{R}))$  yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_t\|_{m,\Omega;\kappa} &\leq C_m (1 + \|\phi_t - \text{id}\|_{1;\kappa}^{m-1}) \\ &\quad \times (\|\nabla H^{0*}\|_{m+1} (1 + \|\phi_t - \text{id}\|_1) + \|\nabla H^{0*}\|_2 \|\phi_t - \text{id}\|_{m;\kappa}) \end{aligned}$$

where the corresponding  $C^\ell$  norms of  $\nabla H^{0*}$  are evaluated on  $\Omega$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi_t - \text{id}\|_{C^0(\mathbb{R}^n)} \|v_t\|_{m,\Omega;\kappa} &\leq C_m \frac{\mathcal{A}_0^0}{\varrho} \left(1 + \frac{\mathcal{A}_1}{\varrho}\right)^{m-1} S_{\ell_0}(\nabla H^{0*}) \\ &\quad \times \left( \|\nabla H^{0*}\|_{m+1} \left(1 + \frac{\mathcal{A}_1}{\varrho}\right) + \|\nabla H^{0*}\|_2 \frac{\mathcal{A}_m^0}{\varrho} S_{\ell(m)}(\nabla H^{0*}) \right) \end{aligned}$$

The interpolation inequalities (A.19) and Remark A.6 yield for any  $r, s \geq 1$  and  $f \in C^{r+s-1}(\overline{\Omega})$  the estimate  $\|f\|_r \|f\|_s \leq C_{r,s} \|f\|_1 \|f\|_{r+s-1}$ , where  $C_{r,s} > 0$  depends only on  $r, s$  and  $n$ . Applying this inequality to  $f = \nabla K_t^*$  and using the convexity of  $\Omega$  we obtain

$$S_{\ell_0}(\nabla H^{0*}) \|\nabla H_t^{0*}\|_{m+1} < C_m S_{\ell_0+m}(\nabla H^{0*}) < C_m S_{\ell(m)+1}(\nabla H^{0*})$$

and

$$S_{\ell(m)}(\nabla H^{0*}) \|\nabla H_t^{0*}\|_2 \leq C_m S_{\ell(m)+1}(\nabla H^{0*}).$$

On the other hand  $\mathcal{A}_0^0 S_{\ell_0}(\nabla H^{0*}) \leq \varepsilon \kappa \varrho$  by (9.154) and  $\mathcal{A}_0^0 \leq \mathcal{A}_m^0$  for  $m \geq 0$  by definition and we obtain

$$\|\phi_t - \text{id}\|_{C^0(\mathbb{R}^n)} \|v_t\|_{m,\Omega;\kappa} \leq C_m \frac{\mathcal{A}_m}{\varrho} \left(1 + \frac{\mathcal{A}_1}{\varrho}\right)^m$$

This completes the proof of the Lemma.  $\square$

To prove (iii) we use suitable cut-off functions in  $\omega$  given by Lemma 9.2.  $\square$

## 9.2 K.A.M. theorem with parameters for symplectic maps

We are going to prove an analogue of Theorem 10.1 for symplectic maps. More precisely, given a  $C^k$  family of “small” exact symplectic perturbations  $(\theta, r) \rightarrow P_t(\theta, r; \omega)$  of the translation  $(\theta, r) \rightarrow R_\omega(\theta, r) := (\theta + \omega, r)$  with a Diophantine frequency  $\omega$ , we are going to find a  $C^k$  family of Kronecker invariant tori of  $P_t(\theta, r; \phi_t(\omega))$ , where  $t \rightarrow \phi_t$  is a  $C^k$  family of diffeomorphisms close to the identity map. Moreover, we will estimate the  $C^m$ ,  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , norm of  $\phi_t - \text{id}$ , and of the displacement of the Kronecker tori with respect to the corresponding unperturbed tori.

Let  $\Omega \subset [0, 2\pi)^{n-1}$  be an open convex set. We identify  $\Omega$  with an open convex subset of  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1}$ . Fix  $k \in \{0, 1\}$  and  $\varrho_0 > 0$  and consider a  $C^k$  family of exact symplectic maps

$$[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow P_t(\cdot; \omega) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times B^{n-1}(0, \varrho_0), \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1})$$

depending smoothly on a parameter  $\omega \in \Omega$ . We suppose that  $P_t(\cdot; \omega)$  is defined by a generating functions  $\tilde{G}_t(\cdot; \omega)$  of the form

$$\tilde{G}_t(\theta, r; \omega) := \langle \theta, r \rangle - \langle \omega, r \rangle - G_t(\theta, r; \omega) \quad (9.163)$$

i.e.

$$P_t(\theta - \omega - \nabla_r G_t(\theta, r; \omega), r; \omega) = (\theta, r - \nabla_\theta G_t(\theta, r; \omega), r)$$

for any  $(\theta, r) \in \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times B^{n-1}(0, \varrho_0)$  and  $\omega \in \Omega$  and that the  $C^2$  norm of  $G_t(\cdot; \omega)$  is sufficiently small. If  $G_t = 0$  then  $P_t(\cdot; \omega)$  becomes a translation with  $\omega$ , namely,  $R_\omega(\theta, r) = (\theta + \omega, r)$ . In general we consider  $G_t$  as a small perturbation depending smoothly on the frequency  $\omega$  as well. Thus the perturbation is a real valued function  $(\theta, I; \omega, t) \mapsto G(\theta, I; \omega, t)$  defined in  $\mathbb{A} \times \Omega \times [0, \delta]$ , where  $\mathbb{A} := \mathbb{T}^n \times B(0, \varrho_0)$ . Hereafter, we assume that

$$G \in C^k([0, \delta]; C^\infty(\mathbb{A} \times \Omega)) \quad (9.164)$$

with  $k = 0$  or  $k = 1$ , i.e. the map  $t \rightarrow G_t := G(\cdot, t) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times B(0, \rho_0) \times \Omega)$  is  $C^k$ -smooth on the interval  $[0, \delta]$ .

Given  $\ell > 0$  and  $0 < \varrho, \kappa \leq 1$  we denote by  $\|G_t\|_{\ell; \varrho, \kappa}$  the weighted Hölder norm

$$\|G_t\|_{\ell; \varrho, \kappa} := \|G_t \circ \sigma_{\varrho, \kappa}\|_{C^\ell(\sigma_{\varrho, \kappa}^{-1}(\mathbb{A} \times \Omega))} \quad (9.165)$$

where  $\sigma_{\varrho, \kappa}$  is the partial dilation  $\sigma_{\varrho, \kappa}(\varphi, I; \omega) := (\varphi, \varrho I; \kappa \omega)$  and the Hölder norms are defined in Section A.1. Note that the function  $\ell \rightarrow \|G_t\|_{\ell; \varrho, \kappa}$  is *increasing* in the interval  $[0, +\infty)$  since the set  $B(0, \rho_0) \times \Omega$  is *convex*.

Fix  $\tau > n - 1$  and  $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ , and define  $\Omega_\kappa$  as the set of all  $(\kappa, \tau)$ -Diophantine vectors satisfying (1.2) and such that  $\text{dist}(\omega, \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \setminus \Omega) \geq \kappa$ , i.e.

$$\Omega_\kappa = D(\kappa, \tau) \cap \overline{\Omega - \kappa}. \quad (9.166)$$

Recall that  $\vartheta_0$ ,  $\ell_0$  and  $\ell(m)$  are defined in (9.151). The following statement is a counterpart of Theorem 10.1 in the case of exact symplectic mappings.

**Theorem 9.4** *There is a positive constant  $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, \tau, \vartheta_0)$  depending only on  $n$ ,  $\tau$  and on  $\vartheta_0$  such that for any  $\delta > 0$ ,  $0 < \kappa < 1$  and  $0 < \varrho \leq \rho_0$  the following holds.*

Let  $P_t$  be a  $C^k$  family of exact symplectic maps with generating functions  $\tilde{G}_t$  satisfying (9.163) and (9.164) and such that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, \delta]} \|G_t\|_{\ell_0; \varrho, \kappa} \leq \epsilon \varrho \kappa. \quad (9.167)$$

Then there exists a  $C^k$  family of maps

$$[0, \delta] \ni t \mapsto \phi_t \in C^\infty(\Omega; \Omega), \quad [0, \delta] \ni t \mapsto \Psi_t = (U_t, V_t) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \Omega; \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times B^{n-1}(0, \varrho))$$

such that

$$(i) \text{ supp } (\phi_t - \text{id}) \subset \Omega - \kappa/2, \text{ supp } ((U_t, V_t) - (\text{id}, 0)) \subset \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times (\Omega - \kappa/2);$$

(ii) For each  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa$  and  $t \in [0, \delta]$  the map  $\Psi_{t, \omega} := \Psi_t(\cdot, \omega) : \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times B(0, \varrho)$  is a smooth embedding,  $\Lambda_t(\omega) := \Psi_{t, \omega}(\mathbb{T}^{n-1})$  is an embedded Lagrangian torus invariant with respect to the exact symplectic map given by  $P_{t, \phi_t(\omega)}(\theta, I) := P(\theta, I; \phi_t(\omega), t)$ , and

$$P_{t, \phi_t(\omega)} \circ \Psi_{t, \omega} = \Psi_{t, \omega} \circ R_\omega \quad \text{on } \mathbb{T}^n;$$

(iii) For any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  there is  $C_m > 0$  depending only on  $m$ ,  $n$ ,  $\tau$  and  $\vartheta_0$  such that for any  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^n$  of length  $|\alpha| + |\beta| \leq m$  the following estimate holds

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \partial_\theta^\alpha (\kappa \partial_\omega)^\beta (U_t(\theta; \omega) - \theta) \right| + \varrho^{-1} \left| \partial_\theta^\alpha (\kappa \partial_\omega)^\beta V_t(\theta; \omega) \right| + \kappa^{-1} \left| (\kappa \partial_\omega)^\beta (\phi_t(\omega) - \omega) \right| \\ & \leq C_m (\varrho \kappa)^{-1} \|G_t\|_{\ell(m); \varrho, \kappa} \end{aligned} \quad (9.168)$$

uniformly in  $(\theta, \omega, t) \in \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \Omega \times [0, \delta]$ .

*Proof.* To simplify the notations we fix  $k = 1$ . The first step in the proof will be to modify  $P_t$  by multiplying  $G_t$  by suitable cut-off functions without changing the corresponding estimates. This allows us to work with compactly supported functions. To this end we use the cut-off functions  $\tilde{\psi}_\varrho$  and  $\psi_\kappa$  constructed in the previous sub-section by means of Lemma 9.2. We set

$G_t^1(\theta, I; \omega) := G_t(\theta, I; \omega) \tilde{\psi}_\varrho(I) \psi_\kappa(\omega)$  and denote by  $P_t^1$  the exact symplectic map with generating function

$$\tilde{G}_t^1(\theta, r; \omega) := \langle \theta, r \rangle - \langle \omega, r \rangle - G_t^1(\theta, r; \omega).$$

The function  $\ell \rightarrow \|G_t\|_{\ell; \varrho, \kappa}$  is *increasing* in the interval  $[0, +\infty)$  since the set  $B(0, \rho_0) \times \Omega$  is *convex*. Then using (A.12) one obtains

$$\|G_t^1\|_{\ell; \varrho, \kappa} \leq C_\ell \|G_t\|_{\ell; \varrho, \kappa},$$

where  $C_\ell$  depends only on  $n$  and  $\ell$ . In particular, it follows from (9.167) that

$$\|\sigma_\varrho^{-1} \text{sgrad } G_t^1\|_{1; \varrho, \kappa} \leq C_1 \|\sigma_\varrho^{-1} \text{sgrad } G_t\|_{\ell_0-1; \varrho, \kappa} \leq C_1 \epsilon \kappa$$

which allows us to apply Lemma A.12. Hereafter

$$\text{sgrad } G_t^1(\theta, r; \omega) := (\nabla_r G_t^1(\theta, r; \omega), -\nabla_\theta G_t^1(\theta, r; \omega))$$

is the symplectic gradient of  $G_t^1$ . We have  $P_t^1(\theta, r; \omega) = (\theta, r)$  for  $(r, \omega)$  outside the set  $B^{n-1}(0, 7\varrho/8) \times (\Omega - \kappa/4)$ . Moreover,  $P_t^1(\theta, r; \omega) = P_t(\theta, r; \omega)$  for any  $(\theta, r, \omega)$  in  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times B^{n-1}(0, \varrho/2) \times (\Omega - \kappa)$  since  $G_t^1 = G_t$  on that set. This allows us to replace  $G_t$  by  $G_t^1$  and  $P_t$  by  $P_t^1$  in the theorem. From now on we suppose that

$$\text{supp } G_t \subset \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times B^{n-1}(0, \varrho) \times (\Omega - \kappa/4).$$

Set

$$\mathcal{N}_{\omega, \omega_n}(r, r_n) := \langle \omega, r \rangle + \omega_n r_n, \quad (\omega, \omega_n) \in \Omega \times I,$$

where  $I \subset \mathbb{R}$  is a small open neighborhood of  $2\pi$ . Using an argument of Douady [9] (see also Theorem 1.1 [50] and Theorem 3.1 [51]), we are going to find a  $C^1$  family of non-degenerate Hamiltonians  $H_t(\cdot; \omega, \omega_n)$  in  $\mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$  depending smoothly on parameters  $(\omega, \omega_n) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}$  with the following properties -  $H_t(\cdot; \omega, \omega_n)$  is a small perturbation of the normal form  $\mathcal{N}_{\omega, \omega_n}$  and the correspondent Poincaré map is given by  $P_t$ . Then we will apply Theorem 10.1. We set  $y = (y', y_n) = (\theta, \theta_n)$ ,  $\eta = (\eta', \eta_n) = (r, r_n)$  and  $\tilde{\omega} := (\omega, \omega_n) \in \tilde{\Omega} := \Omega \times I$ .

**Proposition 9.5** *There is a  $C^1$  family of Hamiltonians*

$$H_t(y, \eta; \tilde{\omega}) := \mathcal{N}_{\tilde{\omega}}(\eta) + h_t(y, \eta'; \omega), \quad h_t \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}, \mathbb{R}),$$

such that

(i)  $P_t = \iota_c^{-1} \circ \Phi_t^{\frac{\omega_n}{2\pi}} \circ \iota_c$  for certain  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ , where  $\iota_c : \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$  is the inclusion map  $\iota_c(y', \eta') = (y', 0, \eta', c - \langle \omega, \eta' \rangle)$  and  $\Phi_t^s$ ,  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ , is the Hamiltonian flow of  $H_t$ ,

(ii) the following estimate holds

$$\|h_t\|_{\ell, \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \Omega; \varrho, \kappa} \leq C_\ell \|G_t\|_{\ell, \mathbb{T}^n \times B^{n-1}(0, \varrho) \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}; \varrho, \kappa}$$

for any  $\ell \geq 2$  and  $0 < \varrho, \kappa \leq 1$ , where  $C_\ell > 0$  depends only on  $\ell$  and  $n$ .

(iii)  $h_t(y, \eta'; \omega) = 0$  for  $|y_n| \leq \pi/2$ .

*Proof.* Choose  $\eta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  such that  $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$ ,  $\eta(s) = 0$  for  $|s| \leq 1/4$  and  $\eta(s) = 1$  for  $|s| \geq 1/2$ . Consider the family of exact symplectic maps  $s \rightarrow P_t^s$  in  $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  for  $s \in \mathbb{R}$  having generating functions of the form

$$\tilde{G}_t^s(\theta, r; \omega) := \langle \theta - s\omega, r \rangle - \eta(s)G_t(\theta, r; \omega), \quad (\theta, r; \omega) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \Omega.$$

Set  $G(\theta, r; \omega, t) = G_t(\theta, r; \omega)$  and denote the symplectic gradient of  $G$  with respect to  $(\theta, r)$  by

$$\text{sgrad } G(\theta, r; \omega, t) := (\nabla_r G(\theta, r; \omega, t), -\nabla_\theta G(\theta, r; \omega, t)).$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} P_t^s(\theta, r; \omega) &= (\theta + s\omega, r) \quad \forall s \in [-1/4, -1/4] \\ P_t^s(\theta, r; \omega) &= P_t(\theta, r; \omega) \quad \forall s \in (-\infty, -1/2] \cup [1/2, +\infty). \end{aligned} \tag{9.169}$$

Denote by  $\xi_t^s := dP_t^s/ds \circ (P_t^s)^{-1}$ ,  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ , the respective vector field. Then

$$\xi_t^s(\theta, r; \omega) = (\omega, 0) \quad \forall s \in (-\infty, -1/2] \cup [-1/4, 1/4] \cup [1/2, +\infty).$$

and we can consider  $s$  as a variable on  $\mathbb{T}$ . We set  $\xi_t(\theta, s, r; \omega) = \xi_t^s(\theta, r)$  where  $(\theta, s) \in \mathbb{T}^n$ .

**Lemma 9.6** *We have  $\xi_t^s(\theta, r; \omega) = (\omega, 0)$  for  $s \in [0, 1/4] \cup [1/2, 2\pi]$ . Moreover, the following estimates hold*

$$\|\sigma_\varrho^{-1} \xi_t\|_{\ell, \mathbb{T}^n \times B(0, \varrho) \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}; \rho, \kappa} \leq C_\ell \|\sigma_\varrho^{-1} \text{sgrad } G_t(\cdot; \omega)\|_{\ell, \mathbb{T}^n \times B(0, \varrho) \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}; \rho, \kappa}$$

where  $\ell \geq 1$  and  $C_\ell > 0$  depends only on  $\ell$  and  $n$ .

*Proof.* The estimates of  $dP_t^s/ds$  and  $(P_t^s)^{-1}$  follow from Proposition A.9, Lemma A.12 and Remark A.13 taking into account (9.167). To obtain the corresponding estimates for the composition  $dP_t^s/ds \circ (P_t^s)^{-1}$  we use Proposition A.9.  $\square$

Notice that the one-form  $\iota(\xi_t^s)d\theta \wedge dr$  is exact, where  $d\theta \wedge dr = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} d\theta_j \wedge dr_j$  is the standard symplectic two-form in  $T^*\mathbb{T}^{n-1}$  and  $\iota(v)$  is the inner product with the vector field  $v$ . This follows from the identity  $\iota(\xi_t^s)d\theta \wedge dr = (P_t^s)_*(\frac{d}{ds}(P_t^s)^*(rd\theta) - d(\iota(\xi_t^s)rd\theta))$  since  $(P_t^s)^*(rd\theta) - rd\theta$  is exact. Let  $h_t^s$  be a primitive of

$$\begin{cases} \iota(\xi_t^s)d\theta \wedge dr = -dh_t^s \\ h_t^s(0, 0; \omega) = 0. \end{cases} \tag{9.170}$$

We denote as above  $y = (y', y_n) = (\theta, \theta_n)$ ,  $\eta = (\eta', \eta_n) = (r, r_n)$  and set

$$h_t(y, \eta'; \omega) = h_t^{y_n}(y', \eta'; \omega) - \langle \omega, y' \rangle, \quad H_t(y, \eta; \omega, \omega_n) := \langle \omega, \eta' \rangle + \omega_n \eta_n + h_t(y, \eta'; \omega).$$

Let  $\mathcal{N}(\eta; \omega, \omega_n) = \langle \omega, \eta' \rangle + \omega_n \eta_n$  be the corresponding normal form. We are going to estimate the Hölder norms of  $h_t := H_t - \mathcal{N}$ . The first equality in (9.170) means that

$$\begin{pmatrix} \partial_\varphi h_t^s \\ \partial_r h_t^s \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \\ -I & 0 \end{pmatrix} \xi_t^s$$

while the second one implies

$$\|h_t\|_{C^0} \leq C(\|\partial_\theta h_t\|_{C^0} + \|(\varrho \partial_I)h_t\|_{C^0}).$$

Then Lemma 9.6 yields for each  $\ell \geq 2$  the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \|h_t\|_{\ell, \mathbb{T}^n \times B(0, \varrho) \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}; \varrho, \kappa} \\ & \leq C'_\ell (\|\partial_\theta h_t\|_{\ell-1, \mathbb{T}^n \times B(0, \varrho) \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}; \varrho, \kappa} + \|(\varrho \partial_I)h_t\|_{\ell-1, \mathbb{T}^n \times B(0, \varrho) \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}; \varrho, \kappa}) \\ & \leq C_\ell \|G_t\|_{\ell, \mathbb{T}^n \times B(0, \varrho) \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}; \varrho, \kappa}. \end{aligned}$$

which proves (ii). Notice that

$$h_t^s(\theta, r) = \langle \omega, r \rangle \quad \forall s \in [0, 1/4] \cup [1/2, 2\pi]$$

since  $\xi_t^s(\theta, r; \omega) = (\omega, 0)$  there. Then

$$h_t(\theta, \theta_n, r, \omega) = h_t^{\theta_n}(\theta, r) - \langle \omega, r \rangle = 0 \quad \forall \theta_n \in [0, 1/4] \cup [1/2, 2\pi]$$

which gives (iii). To obtain (i), consider the Hamiltonian vector field  $X_{H_t}$  given by

$$\iota(X_{H_t})dy \wedge d\eta = -dH_t(y, \eta).$$

By (9.170) we get

$$(\partial_r H_t(\theta, \theta_n, r, r_n), -\partial_\theta H_t(\theta, \theta_n, r, r_n)) = (\partial_r h_t^{\theta_n}(\theta, r), -\partial_\theta h_t^{\theta_n}(\theta, r)) = \xi_t^{\theta_n}(\theta, r).$$

Moreover,  $\partial_{r_n} H_t(\theta, \theta_n, r, r_n) = \omega_n$ . Setting  $P_t^s(\theta, r) = (p_t^s(\theta, r), q_t^s(\theta, r))$  we obtain

$$\Phi_t^s(\theta, \theta_n, r, r_n) = (p_t^s(\theta, r), \theta_n + s\omega_n, q_t^s(\theta, r), q_n^s(\theta, \theta_n, r, r_n))$$

for  $s \in [0, 2\pi]$ , where  $t \rightarrow q_n$  is a  $C^1$  family of smooth functions. Given  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  we denote by  $\Sigma_c := \{H_t = c\}$  the corresponding level set of the Hamiltonian  $H_t$ . This implies

$$\Phi_t^{\frac{2\pi}{\omega_n}}(\theta, 0, r, r_n) = (p_t^{\frac{2\pi}{\omega_n}}(\theta, r), 2\pi, q_t^{\frac{2\pi}{\omega_n}}(\theta, r), q_n^{\frac{2\pi}{\omega_n}}(\theta, 0, r, r_n)) \in \Sigma_c$$

for  $(\theta, 0, r, r_n) \in \Sigma_c$ . On the other hand  $|1 - \omega_n/2\pi| < 1/2$  if the interval  $I$  is sufficiently small and taking into account (9.169) we get

$$\left(p_t^{\frac{2\pi}{\omega_n}}(\theta, r), q_t^{\frac{2\pi}{\omega_n}}(\theta, r)\right) = P_t(\theta, r) \quad \forall \omega_n \in I.$$

This implies (i) and completes the proof of the proposition.  $\square$

In particular, we have

$$\|h_t\|_{\ell_0, \mathbb{T}^n \times B(0, \varrho) \times \mathbb{R}^n; \varrho, \kappa} \leq C\epsilon\kappa\varrho$$

for  $t \in [0, a]$ , where  $C > 0$  depends only on  $\ell_0$  and  $n$ . Then Proposition 9.5 allows us to apply Theorem 10.1 to the perturbation  $H_t$  of  $\mathcal{N}$  in  $\mathbb{T}^n \times B^n(0, \varrho) \times \tilde{\Omega}$ , where  $\tilde{\Omega} := \Omega \times (1/2, 3/2)$ . Denote by

$$\tilde{\Psi}_t = (\tilde{U}_t, \tilde{V}_t, \tilde{\phi}_t) : \mathbb{T}^n \times B^n(0, \varrho) \times \tilde{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n \times B^n(0, \varrho) \times \tilde{\Omega}$$

the map given by Theorem 10.1. To obtain the map  $\Psi_t$  from  $\tilde{\Psi}_t$  we use an argument of Douady [9]. Fix  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa$  and  $t \in [0, \delta]$ . Then  $\tilde{\omega} := (\omega, 2\pi) \in \tilde{\Omega}_\kappa := \tilde{D}(\kappa, \tau) \cap (\tilde{\Omega} - \kappa)$ , where  $\tilde{D}(\kappa, \tau)$  is given by (9.146). By Theorem 10.1 there exists a  $C^1$  family of Kronecker invariant tori  $\tilde{\Lambda}_t(\tilde{\omega})$  of the flow  $\Phi_t^s$  of the Hamiltonian  $H_t$  with a frequency vector  $\tilde{\omega}$  lying on a certain energy surface  $\Sigma_t := \{H_t = c_t\}$ . Moreover,

$$\left( \tilde{U}_t(y + s\tilde{\omega}, \tilde{\omega}), \tilde{V}_t(y + s\tilde{\omega}) \right) = \Phi_t^s \left( \tilde{U}_t(y, \tilde{\omega}), \tilde{V}_t(y, \tilde{\omega}) \right) \quad (9.171)$$

for any  $s \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $y \in \mathbb{T}^n$ . On the other hand,

$$\Phi_t^s(y', y_n, \eta; \omega) = (z'_t(s, y, \eta; \tilde{\omega}), y_n + s\omega_n, \zeta_t(s, y, \eta; \omega))$$

since  $\partial H_t / \partial y_n = \omega_n$  and the last coordinate  $\tilde{U}_{t,n}$  of  $\tilde{U}_t$  satisfies the equality  $\tilde{U}_{t,n}(y + s\tilde{\omega}) = \tilde{U}_{t,n}(y) + s\omega_n$  for any  $y \in \mathbb{T}^n$  and  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then  $d\tilde{U}_{t,n}(y + s\tilde{\omega}) = d\tilde{U}_{t,n}(y)$ , and since the flow  $s \mapsto s\tilde{\omega}$  is ergodic on  $\mathbb{T}^n$  (recall that  $\tilde{\omega}$  is a Diophantine frequency) we get  $d\tilde{U}_{t,n}(y) = d\tilde{U}_{t,n}(0) := a_t$  for any  $y \in \mathbb{T}^n$ , which implies that  $\tilde{U}_{t,n}(y) = \langle a_t, y \rangle$  and  $a_t \in \mathbb{Z}^n$  is constant. On the other hand,  $\tilde{U}_t$  is close to the identity map, hence,  $a'_t = 0$ ,  $a_{t,n} = 1$  and  $\tilde{U}_{t,n}(y) = y_n$ .

Using (i) and (iv) in Proposition 9.5 one obtains that

$$\Lambda_t(\omega) := \iota(\tilde{\Lambda}_t(\tilde{\omega})) = \tilde{\Lambda}_t(\tilde{\omega}) \cap \{y_n = 0, H_t = c_t\} \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega_\kappa$$

is a Kronecker invariant torus of  $P_t$  with a frequency vector  $\omega$ . Setting  $U_t(\theta, \omega) = \tilde{U}_t(\theta, 0, \tilde{\omega})$  and  $V_t(\theta, \omega) = \tilde{V}_t(\theta, 0, \tilde{\omega})$  we obtain (i). Moreover, (9.155) implies (9.168). This completes the proof of Theorem 9.7.  $\square$

### 9.3 K.A.M. theorems for $C^k$ families of symplectic maps

The aim of this section is to obtain  $C^k$  families of Kronecker invariant tori of  $C^k$  families of exact maps close to the family  $(\theta, r) \rightarrow (\theta + \nabla K_t(r), r)$ ,  $t \in [0, \delta]$ .

Let  $\Omega \subset [0, 2\pi]^{n-1}$  be an open convex set which we identify with an open convex subset of  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1}$ . Fix  $k \in \{0, 1\}$  and consider a  $C^k$ -family of real-valued functions

$$[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow K_t^* \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega}, \mathbb{R})$$

satisfying the non-degeneracy condition

$$\nabla K_t^* : \Omega \longrightarrow D_t := \nabla K_t^*(\Omega) \text{ is a diffeomorphism.} \quad (9.172)$$

where  $\overline{\Omega}$  is the closure of  $\Omega$ . For any  $t \in [0, \delta]$  the Legendre transform  $K_t : D_t \rightarrow \Omega$  of  $K_t^*$  is in  $C^\infty(D_t, \mathbb{R})$  and it satisfies the non-degenerate condition (9.143). Moreover, the corresponding family of functions  $[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow K_t \in C^\infty(D_t, \mathbb{R})$  is  $C^k$  smooth. We set  $\mathbb{A}_t := \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times D_t$  and denote by

$$Q_t : \mathbb{A}_t \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_t, \quad Q_t(\theta, r) = (\theta + \nabla K_t(r), r) \quad (9.173)$$

the corresponding family of exact symplectic maps on  $\mathbb{A}_t$ . The frequency vector of  $Q_t$  on the invariant torus  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \{r\}$  is  $\omega = \nabla K_t(r) \in \Omega$ .

We consider a  $C^k$ -family of exact symplectic maps

$$[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow P_t \in C^\infty(\mathbb{A}_t, \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}) \quad (9.174)$$

close  $Q_t$ . We suppose that  $P_t$  is defined by a generating function  $\tilde{G}_t$  of the form

$$\tilde{G}_t(\theta, r) := \langle \theta, r \rangle - K_t(r) - G_t(\theta, r) \quad (9.175)$$

where the map

$$[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow G_t \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times D_t, \mathbb{R})$$

is  $C^k$  smooth with  $k = 0$  or  $k = 1$ . This means that

$$P_t(\theta - \nabla K_t(r) - \nabla_r G_t(\theta, r), r) = (\theta, r - \nabla_\theta G_t(\theta, r))$$

for any  $(\theta, r) \in \mathbb{A}_t$ . We assume as well that the  $C^2$  norm of  $G_t$  is sufficiently small. Then the inverse function theorem implies that the map  $\theta \rightarrow \theta - \nabla_r G_t(\theta, r)$  is a diffeomorphism of  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1}$  for any fixed  $r \in D_t$  and  $P_t$  is well defined.

Denote by  $R_t$  the exact symplectic map with generating function  $(\theta, r) \rightarrow \langle \theta, r \rangle - G_t(\theta, r)$ , i.e.  $R_t(\theta - \nabla_r G_t(\theta, r), r) = (\theta, r - \nabla_\theta G_t(\theta, r))$ . One can show that  $P_t = R_t \circ Q_t$  on  $\mathbb{A}_t$  (see Lemma A.14).

Given  $\varrho, \kappa \in (0, 1)$  and  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  we set

$$\mathcal{B}_m^0 := \sup_{0 \leq j \leq m} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq \delta} (\varrho^2 \|\partial^2 K_t\|_{\ell(j), D_t; \kappa} + \|G_t\|_{\ell(j), \mathbb{A}_t; \kappa}), \quad (9.176)$$

where  $\|G_t\|_{\ell, \mathbb{A}_t; \kappa} := \|G_t \circ \sigma_\kappa\|_{C^\ell(\sigma_\kappa^{-1}(\mathbb{A}_t))}$ ,  $\sigma_\kappa$  is defined by  $\sigma_\kappa(x, \xi) = (x, \kappa\xi)$ , and

$$\|u\|_{\ell, D; \kappa} = \sup_{0 \leq m \leq \ell} \|u\|_{\ell-m, D; \kappa}.$$

Recall that  $\vartheta_0$ ,  $\ell_0$  and  $\ell(m)$  are defined in (9.151). The sequence  $\mathcal{B}_m^0$ ,  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , is increasing by definition.

To formulate the smallness condition in the K.A.M. theorem below we need as well the notation

$$S_\ell(\nabla K^*) := \sup_{0 \leq t \leq \delta} (1 + \|\nabla K_t^*\|_{C^1(\Omega)})^{\ell-1} (1 + \|\nabla K_t^*\|_{C^\ell(\Omega)}) \quad (9.177)$$

introduced in (9.150). This is an increasing sequence with respect to  $\ell \in [1, +\infty)$  since  $\Omega$  is convex. For any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  we set

$$\mathcal{B}_m := \mathcal{B}_m^0 S_{\ell(m)+1}(\nabla K^*). \quad (9.178)$$

**Theorem 9.7** *There exists  $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, \tau, \vartheta_0) > 0$  depending only on  $n$ ,  $\tau$  and  $\vartheta_0$  such that the following holds.*

Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{T}^{n-1}$  be an open convex set,  $[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow K_t^* \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega}, \mathbb{R})$  a  $C^k$  family satisfying (9.172) and let  $\varrho > 0$  and  $\kappa > 0$  be such that  $0 < \varrho \leq \kappa \leq 1$  and  $\Omega_\kappa \neq \emptyset$ . Consider a  $C^k$  family of exact symplectic maps  $[0, \delta] \ni P_t \in C^\infty(\mathbb{A}_t, \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1})$  with generating functions  $\tilde{G}_t$  of the form (9.175) such that

$$\mathcal{B}_0^0 S_{\ell_0}(\nabla K^*) = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq \delta} (\varrho^2 \|\partial^2 K_t\|_{\ell_0, D_t; \kappa} + \|G_t\|_{\ell_0, \mathbb{A}_t; \kappa}) S_{\ell_0}(\nabla K^*) \leq \epsilon \varrho \kappa. \quad (9.179)$$

Then there is a  $C^k$  family  $[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow f_t = (u_t, v_t) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \Omega; \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times D_t)$  such that

(i) for any  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa$ ,  $[0, \delta] \ni s \rightarrow \Lambda_t(\omega) = f_{t,\omega}(\mathbb{T}^{n-1})$  is a  $C^k$  family of Kronecker invariant tori of  $P_t$  with a frequency vector  $\omega$ , where  $f_{t,\omega} := f_t(\cdot; \omega)$ , and the following diagram is commutative

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{T}^{n-1} & \xrightarrow{R_\omega} & \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \\ \downarrow f_{t,\omega} & & \downarrow f_{t,\omega} \\ \Lambda_t(\omega) & \xrightarrow{P_t} & \Lambda_t(\omega) \end{array}$$

(ii) for any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  the following estimates hold

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_\varphi^\alpha (\kappa \partial_\omega)^\beta (u_t(\varphi; \omega) - \varphi)| &\leq C_m \frac{\mathcal{B}_m}{\kappa \varrho} \\ |\partial_\varphi^\alpha (\kappa \partial_\omega)^\beta (v_t(\varphi; \omega) - \nabla K_t^*(\omega))| &\leq C_m \frac{\mathcal{B}_m}{\varrho} \left(1 + \frac{\mathcal{B}_1}{\varrho}\right)^m \end{aligned} \quad (9.180)$$

for any  $(\varphi, \omega) \in \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \Omega$ ,  $t \in [0, \delta]$ , and multi-indices  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^{n-1}$  with  $|\alpha| + |\beta| \leq m$ , where the constant  $C_m > 0$  depends only on  $n, \tau, \vartheta_0$  and  $m$ ,

(iii)  $\text{supp}((u_t, v_t) - (\text{id}, \nabla K_t^*)) \subset \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times (\Omega - \kappa/2)$ .

We note that the  $C^1$  families of invariant tori  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$ ,  $t \in [0, \delta]$ , given by the theorem are uniquely defined.

*Proof.* The proof is similar to that of Theorem 9.1 and we give only the main steps in it. We are going to apply Theorem 9.4. To this end we will first construct the function  $\tilde{G}_t(\theta, r; \omega)$  in (9.163).

*Step 1. Construction of the generating function  $\tilde{G}_t(\theta, r; \omega)$ .* Given  $\omega \in \Omega - \kappa/4$  and  $I$  the ball  $B^{n-1}(0, \varrho)$ , we set  $r = \nabla K_t^*(\omega) + I$ . Choosing  $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, \tau, \vartheta_0) < 1/9$  in (9.179) we obtain as in the proof of Theorem 9.1 the following relation

$$\forall \omega \in \Omega - \kappa/4, \forall I \in B^{n-1}(0, \varrho), \quad \begin{cases} \nabla K_t^*(\omega) + I \in D_t & \text{and} \\ \nabla K_t(\nabla K_t^*(\omega) + I) \in \Omega - \frac{1}{8}\kappa. \end{cases} \quad (9.181)$$

By Taylor's formula we obtain

$$\tilde{G}_t(\theta, r) = \langle \theta, \nabla K_t^*(\omega) \rangle + \langle \theta, I \rangle - K_t(\nabla K_t^*(\omega)) - \langle \omega, I \rangle - G_t^0(I; \omega) - G_t^1(\theta, I; \omega), \quad (9.182)$$

where

$$G_t^0(I; \omega) = \int_0^1 (1-s) \langle \partial^2 K_t(\nabla K_t^*(\omega) + sI) I, I \rangle ds$$

and

$$G_t^1(\theta, I; \omega) := G_t(\theta, \nabla K_t^*(\omega) + I).$$

It follows from (9.181) that the functions  $G_t^0$  and  $G_t^1$  are well defined for  $I \in B^{n-1}(0, \varrho)$  and  $\omega \in \Omega - \kappa/4$ . Denote by  $P_{t,\omega} : \mathbb{A}_t \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  the exact symplectic map defined by means of the generating function

$$\begin{aligned} (\theta, I) \rightarrow \tilde{G}_{t,\omega}(\theta, I) &:= \langle \theta, I \rangle - \langle \omega, I \rangle - G_t^0(I; \omega) - G_t^1(\theta, I; \omega) \\ &= \tilde{G}_t(\theta, \nabla K_t^*(\omega) + I) - \langle \theta, \nabla K_t^*(\omega) \rangle - K_t(\nabla K_t^*(\omega)) \end{aligned}$$

and set  $\psi_\omega(\theta, I) = (\theta, \nabla K_t^*(\omega) + I)$ .

**Lemma 9.8** *For any  $\omega \in \Omega - \kappa/4$  the map  $P_{t,\omega} : \mathbb{A}_t \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  is well defined and*

$$P_{t,\omega} = \psi_\omega^{-1} \circ P_t \circ \psi_\omega$$

on  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times B^{n-1}(0, \varrho)$  provided that the constant  $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, \tau, \vartheta_0)$  in (9.179) is sufficiently small.

*Proof.* The smallness condition (9.179) implies that  $\|(\partial_\theta \nabla_I \tilde{G}_{t,\omega}(\theta, I) - \text{Id}_n)\| \leq C\epsilon\varrho$  for  $(\theta, I; \omega) \in \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times B^{n-1}(0, \varrho) \times (\Omega - \kappa/4)$ , where  $C = C(n)$  depends only on the dimension  $n$  and  $\text{Id}_n \in M_n(\mathbb{R}^{n-1})$  is the identity matrix. Choosing  $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, \tau, \vartheta_0)$  sufficiently small we obtain that the map  $\theta \rightarrow \varphi = \nabla_I \tilde{G}_{t,\omega}(\theta, I)$  is a diffeomorphism on  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1}$  for any fixed  $I \in B^{n-1}(0, \varrho)$  and  $\omega \in \Omega - \kappa/4$ , hence,  $P_{t,\omega}$  is well-defined. Notice that  $\nabla_I \tilde{G}_{t,\omega}(\theta, I) = \nabla_r \tilde{G}_t(\theta, \nabla K_t^*(\omega) + I)$  and  $\nabla_\theta \tilde{G}_{t,\omega}(\theta, I) = \nabla_\theta \tilde{G}_t(\theta, \nabla K_t^*(\omega) + I) - \nabla K_t^*(\omega)$ . Then

$$(\psi_\omega \circ P_{t,\omega})(\nabla_r \tilde{G}_t(\theta, \nabla K_t^*(\omega) + I), I) = (\theta, \nabla_\theta \tilde{G}_t(\theta, \nabla K_t^*(\omega) + I)).$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} (P_t \circ \psi_\omega)(\nabla_r \tilde{G}_t(\theta, \nabla K_t^*(\omega) + I), I) &= P_t(\nabla_r \tilde{G}_t(\theta, \nabla K_t^*(\omega) + I), \nabla K_t^*(\omega) + I) \\ &= (\theta, \nabla_\theta \tilde{G}_t(\theta, \nabla K_t^*(\omega) + I)) \end{aligned}$$

and we obtain that  $\psi_\omega \circ P_{t,\omega} = P_t \circ \psi_\omega$  since the map  $\theta \rightarrow \nabla_r \tilde{G}_t(\theta, r)$  is a diffeomorphism.  $\square$

*Step 2. Hölder estimates of  $\tilde{G}_t$ .* We are going to apply Theorem 9.4 to the family of exact symplectic maps  $P_t(\cdot; \omega) := \tilde{P}_{t,\omega}(\cdot)$ . To this end we evaluate the weighted norms of  $G_t^0$  and  $G_t^1$ . We have  $G_t^0 = Q_t^0 \circ (\text{id}, \nabla K_t^*)$ , where

$$Q_t^0(I; r) = \int_0^1 (1-s) \langle \partial^2 K_t(r + sI)I, I \rangle ds$$

is well defined and smooth in  $\bar{\Gamma}$ ,  $\Gamma := B^{n-1}(0, \varrho) \times (\Omega - \kappa/4)$ . As in the proof of Theorem 9.1 we obtain that

$$\|Q_t^0\|_{\ell, \Gamma; \varrho, \kappa} \leq C_\ell \varrho^2 \|\partial^2 K_t\|_{\ell, D_t; \kappa}.$$

Since  $\Omega$  is convex and  $K_t^* \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$  using Proposition A.9, 3., and Remark A.10 as in the proof of Theorem 9.1 we obtain for any  $\ell \geq 1$  the estimate

$$\|G_t^0\|_{\ell; \varrho, \kappa} \leq C_\ell \varrho^2 \|\partial^2 K_t\|_{\ell, D_t; \kappa} S_\ell(\nabla K^*).$$

Moreover,  $\|G_t^1\|_{\ell; \varrho, \kappa} \leq \|G_t^1\|_{\ell; \kappa, \kappa} \leq C_\ell \|G_t\|_{\ell; \kappa} S_\ell(\nabla K^*)$  since  $0 < \varrho \leq \kappa \leq 1$  and we obtain

$$\|G_t^0\|_{\ell; \varrho, \kappa} + \|G_t^1\|_{\ell; \varrho, \kappa} \leq C_\ell (\varrho^2 \|\partial^2 K_t\|_{\ell, D_t; \kappa} + \|G_t\|_{\ell, \mathbb{A}_t; \kappa}) S_\ell(\nabla K^*). \quad (9.183)$$

*Step 3. Applying Theorem 9.4.* Now (9.179) gives

$$\|G_t^0\|_{\ell_0; \varrho, \kappa} + \|G_t^1\|_{\ell_0; \varrho, \kappa} \leq \mathcal{B}_0 S_{\ell_0}(\nabla K^*) \leq \epsilon \varrho \kappa.$$

This allows us to apply Theorem 9.4 to the family of exact symplectic maps  $P_t(\cdot; \omega) = \tilde{P}_{t, \omega}(\cdot)$ . Set  $\Psi_t = (u_t, v_t)$ , where  $u_t = U_t$ ,  $v_t = (\nabla K_t^*) \circ \phi_t + V_t$  and  $(U_t, V_t, \phi_t)$  are given by Theorem 9.4. Notice that  $\|V_t\|_{C^0} \leq c\epsilon\varrho$  in view of the estimates in (ii), Theorem 9.4, where the constant  $c$  depends only on  $n$ ,  $\tau$  and  $\vartheta_0$ , and taking  $\epsilon < \min(1, 1/c)$  we obtain  $V_t(\theta; \omega) \in B^{n-1}(0, \varrho)$  for any  $\theta \in \mathbb{T}^{n-1}$  and  $\omega \in \Omega - \kappa$ . In the same way we get  $\phi_t(\omega) \in \Omega - \kappa/4$  for  $\omega \in \Omega - \kappa$ .

Now Lemma 9.8 implies that for any  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa$  and  $t \in [0, \delta]$  the Lagrangian manifold  $\Lambda_t(\omega) := \Psi_t(\mathbb{T}^{n-1}; \omega)$  is a Kronecker invariant torus of  $P_t$  of a frequency vector  $\omega$  satisfying (i) in Theorem 9.7.

*Step 4. Estimates of  $u_t$  and  $v_t$ .*

The estimates (ii), Theorem 9.4, imply (ii) in Theorem 9.7. To estimate the derivatives of

$$v_t - \nabla K_t^* = V_t + (\nabla K_t^*) \circ \phi_t - \nabla K_t^*$$

we use (ii), Theorem 9.4 and the following Lemma which is an analogue of Lemma 9.3.

**Lemma 9.9** *For any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  the following estimate holds*

$$\|(\nabla K_t^*) \circ \phi_t - \nabla K_t^*\|_{m, \Omega; \kappa} \leq C_m \frac{\mathcal{B}_m}{\varrho} \left(1 + \frac{\mathcal{B}_1}{\varrho}\right)^m.$$

To prove (iii) we use suitable cut-off functions in  $\omega$  given by Lemma 9.2. □

## 9.4 Birkhoff Normal Forms for $C^k$ -families of symplectic maps

Let  $\Omega \subset [0, 2\pi]^{n-1}$  be an open convex set which we identify with an open convex subset of  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1}$ . Fix  $\tau > n - 1$  and denote by  $\kappa_0(\Omega)$  the supremum of all  $0 < \kappa \leq 1$  such that the set  $\Omega_\kappa = D(\kappa, \tau) \cap \overline{\Omega - \kappa}$  is of positive Lebesgue measure. Given  $0 < \kappa < \kappa_0(\Omega)$  we denote by  $\Omega_\kappa^0$  the set of points of  $\Omega_\kappa$  of *positive Lebesgue density*. Recall that  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$  if the Lebesgue measure of  $\Omega_\kappa \cap U$  is positive for any neighborhood  $U$  of  $\omega$ . Then  $\Omega_\kappa \setminus \Omega_\kappa^0$  is a set of measure zero. Fix  $0 < \vartheta_0 \leq 1$  such that  $2\tau + \vartheta_0 \notin \mathbb{Z}$  and define  $\ell_0$  and  $\ell(m)$ ,  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  as in (9.151), i. e.  $\ell_0 := 2\tau + 2 + \vartheta_0$  and  $\ell(m) := 2m(\tau + 1) + \ell_0$  for  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ .

We are going to use as well the notations  $\mathcal{B}_m$  and  $S_\ell(\nabla K_t^*)$  introduced in (9.178) and (9.177).

To construct a BNF we have to deal with the second differential  $d^2 K_t$  of the Legendre transform  $K_t$  of  $K_t^*$ . We denote by  $\partial^2 K_t(I)$  its Hessian matrix. Its norm could be very large and to measure it we introduce a parameter  $\lambda > 1$ . More precisely, we suppose below that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, \delta]} \|\partial^2 K_t\|_{2, D_t; \kappa} \leq \lambda < \infty, \quad (9.184)$$

where  $\lambda \geq 1$ .

**Theorem 9.10** *There exists  $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, \tau, \vartheta_0) > 0$  depending only on  $n$ ,  $\tau$ , and  $\vartheta_0$  such that the following holds.*

Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{T}^{n-1}$  be an open convex set and  $0 < \varrho < \kappa < \kappa_0(\Omega)$ . Let  $[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow K_t^* \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega}, \mathbb{R})$  be a  $C^k$  family satisfying the non-degeneracy condition (9.172) and suppose that its Legendre transform  $K_t$  satisfies (9.184). Let  $[0, \delta] \ni P_t \in C^\infty(\mathbb{A}_t, \mathbb{A})$ , be a  $C^k$  family of exact symplectic maps defined by generating functions  $\tilde{G}_t(\theta, r) = \langle \theta, r \rangle - K_t(r) - G_t(\theta, r)$  such that

$$\mathcal{B}_2 \leq \epsilon \varrho \kappa \lambda^{-4}. \quad (9.185)$$

Then

- (i) there exist  $C^k$ -smooth with respect to  $t \in [0, \delta]$  families of exact symplectic maps  $\chi_t : \mathbb{A}_t \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_t$  and of real valued functions  $L_t \in C^\infty(D_t)$  and  $R_t^0 \in C^\infty(\mathbb{A}_t)$  such that
  - (a)  $(\varphi, I) \mapsto \langle \varphi, I \rangle - L_t(I) - R_t^0(\varphi, I)$  is a generating function of  $P_t^0 := \chi_t^{-1} \circ P_t \circ \chi_t$ ;
  - (b)  $\nabla L_t : D_t \rightarrow \Omega$  is a diffeomorphism,  $L_t = K_t$  outside  $D_t^1 := \nabla K_t^*(\Omega - \kappa/2)$ , and  $\nabla L_t^*(\omega) = I_t(\omega)$  is given by (1.6) for each  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$ ;
  - (c)  $R_t^0$  is flat at  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \nabla L_t(\Omega_\kappa^0)$ ;
- (ii) For any  $t \in [0, \delta]$  and  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  the following estimates hold

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\sigma_\kappa^{-1}(\chi - \text{id})\|_{m, \mathbb{A}_t; \kappa} + \|\sigma_\kappa^{-1}(\chi^{-1} - \text{id})\|_{m, \mathbb{A}_t; \kappa} \\ & \leq \frac{C_m}{\varrho \kappa} \mathcal{B}_{m+1} \lambda^{2m} (\lambda + \|\partial^2 K_t\|_{m+1, D_t; \kappa}) \end{aligned} \quad (9.186)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla L_t - \nabla K_t\|_{m, D_t; \kappa} + \|\sigma_\kappa \nabla R_t^0\|_{m, D_t; \kappa} \\ & \leq \frac{C_m}{\varrho} \mathcal{B}_{m+1} \lambda^{2m} (\lambda + \|\partial^2 K_t\|_{m+1, D_t; \kappa}), \end{aligned} \quad (9.187)$$

where the constant  $C_m > 0$  depends only on  $n, \tau, \vartheta_0$  and  $m$ .

Before proving the Theorem we observe that

**Remark 9.11** (Birkhoff Normal Form) Let  $k = 1$ . Then for any  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$  the map

$$[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow \Lambda_t(\omega) := \chi_t(\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \{I_t(\omega)\})$$

provides a  $C^1$  family of invariant tori of  $P_s$  with a frequency vector  $\omega$  and taking into account Lemma 6.3 we obtain

$$P_t^0(\varphi, I) = (\varphi + \nabla L_t(I), I) + O_N(|I - \nabla L_t^*(\omega)|^N)$$

for any  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ . Moreover, the last formula can be differentiated  $N - 1$  times with respect to  $(\varphi, I)$ . Hence, Theorem 9.10 gives a simultaneous Birkhoff Normal Form of  $P_t$  on the invariant tori  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$ , where  $t \in [0, \delta]$  and the frequency vectors  $\omega$  are in  $\Omega_\kappa^0$ . Recall as well that the complement of  $\Omega_\kappa^0$  in  $\Omega_\kappa$  is of Lebesgue measure zero.

*Proof of Theorem 9.10.* Without loss of generality we consider only the case when  $k = 1$ . We devide the proof in several steps.

*Step 1. Writing  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$  as graphs.* For any  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa$  and  $t \in [0, \delta]$  the Lagrangian manifold

$$\Lambda_t(\omega) := \{(u_t(\theta; \omega), v_t(\theta; \omega)) : \theta \in \mathbb{T}^n\}$$

given by Theorem 9.7 is a Kronecker invariant torus of  $P_t$  of a frequency vector  $\omega$  satisfying (i) of Theorem 9.7. Firstly we will solve the equation  $\varphi = u_t(\theta, \omega)$  with respect to  $\theta$  and get the respective estimates of the solution. To this end we consider the map  $w_t : \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$  defined by  $w_t(\theta, \omega) = (u_t(\theta, \omega), \omega)$ , where  $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ . Recall from Theorem 9.7, (iii), that  $\text{supp}(w_t - \text{id}) \subset \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times (\Omega - \kappa/2)$ . It follows from (9.180) and (9.185) that

$$\|\sigma_\kappa^{-1}(w_t - \text{id})\|_{1;\kappa} = \|w_t - \text{id}\|_{1;\kappa} \leq C_1 \epsilon < (2n - 2)^{-1}$$

choosing  $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, \tau, \vartheta_0)$  small enough (recall that  $C_1$  depends only on  $n, \tau$  and  $\vartheta_0$ ). Then applying Proposition A.11 we obtain a solution  $\theta_t(\varphi, \omega) = \varphi + \psi_t(\varphi, \omega)$  of the equation  $\varphi = u_t(\theta, \omega)$ , where  $(\varphi, \omega) \in \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \Omega$ . Then  $\text{supp} \psi_t \subset \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times (\Omega - \kappa/2)$  and

$$\|\psi_t\|_{m;\kappa} \leq \frac{C_m}{\kappa \varrho} \mathcal{B}_m \quad (9.188)$$

for any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , where the constant  $C_m > 0$  depends only on  $n, \tau, \vartheta_0$  and  $m$ . Setting  $\tilde{F}_t(\varphi, \omega) = v_t(\theta_t(\varphi, \omega), \omega)$  and

$$F_t(\varphi, \omega) := -\nabla K_t^*(\omega) + \tilde{F}_t(\varphi, \omega) \quad (9.189)$$

for  $(\varphi, \omega) \in \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \Omega$  we write

$$\Lambda_t(\omega) = \{(\varphi, \tilde{F}_t(\varphi, \omega)) : \varphi \in \mathbb{T}^{n-1}\} = \{(\varphi, \nabla K_t^*(\omega) + F_t(\varphi, \omega)) : \varphi \in \mathbb{T}^{n-1}\}, \quad \omega \in \Omega_\kappa. \quad (9.190)$$

Notice that  $\text{supp} F_t \subset \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times (\Omega - \kappa/2)$ . We are going to prove that

$$\|F_t\|_{m;\kappa} \leq \frac{C_m}{\varrho} \mathcal{B}_m, \quad (9.191)$$

for any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , where the constant  $C_m > 0$  depends only on  $n, \tau, \vartheta_0$  and  $m$ . To this end we write

$$F_t(\varphi, \omega) = (v_t(\varphi, \omega) - \nabla K_t^*(\omega)) + (v_t(\theta_t(\varphi, \omega), \omega) - v_t(\varphi, \omega)).$$

The estimate of  $v_t(\varphi, \omega) - \nabla K_t^*(\omega)$  follows directly from (9.180) using the inequality  $\mathcal{B}_1 \leq \mathcal{B}_2 \leq \varepsilon \kappa \varrho \leq \varrho$ . To obtain the estimate of the second term of (9.189) we write

$$v_t(\theta_t(\varphi, \omega), \omega) - v_t(\varphi, \omega) = \int_0^1 (d_\theta v_t)(\varphi + s\psi_t(\varphi, \omega)) \psi_t(\varphi, \omega) ds.$$

Then one uses (A.20), Proposition A.9, 2, and (9.185) as well.

Denote by  $p : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^{n-1}$  the natural projection.

**Lemma 9.12** *There is a  $C^1$  family of real-valued functions  $h_t \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \Omega)$  and  $I_t \in C^\infty(\Omega)$  in  $t \in [0, \delta]$  such that  $h_t^0(x, \omega) := h_t(x, \omega) - \langle x, I_t(\omega) \rangle$  is 1-periodic with respect to  $x$  and*

- (i)  $\forall (x, \omega) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \Omega_\kappa, \nabla_x h_t(x, \omega) = \tilde{F}_t(p(x), \omega),$
- (ii)  $\nabla_x h_t^0(x, \omega) = 0$  and  $I_t(\omega) = \nabla K_t^*(\omega)$  for  $\omega \notin \Omega - \kappa/2,$
- (iii)  $\|h_t^0\|_{m;\kappa} + \|I_t - \nabla K_t^*\|_{m;\kappa} \leq \frac{C_m}{\varrho} \mathcal{B}_m$

for  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , where  $C_m$  is a positive constant depending only on  $n, \tau, \vartheta_0$  and  $m$ .

*Proof.* To obtain  $h_t$  we consider the function

$$\tilde{h}_t(x, \omega) = \int_{\gamma_x} \sigma = \int_0^1 \langle \tilde{F}_t(p(sx), \omega), x \rangle ds = \langle \nabla K_t^*(\omega), x \rangle + \int_0^1 \langle F_t(p(sx), \omega), x \rangle ds$$

for  $(x, \omega) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \Omega$ , where  $\gamma_x = \{(sx, \tilde{F}_t(p(sx), \omega)) : 0 \leq s \leq 1\}$  and  $\sigma = \xi dx$  is the canonical one-form on  $T^*\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ . In view of (9.191), the function  $Q_t^0(x, \omega) := \tilde{h}_t(x, \omega) - \langle \nabla K_t^*(\omega), x \rangle$  satisfies the estimate

$$\|Q_t^0\|_{m;\kappa} \leq \frac{C_m}{\varrho} \mathcal{B}_m \quad (9.192)$$

for  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . We set

$$I_{tj}(\omega) = \tilde{h}_t(e_j, \omega), \quad \omega \in \Omega,$$

where  $\{e_1, \dots, e_{n-1}\}$  is the canonical basis in  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ . Then (9.192) implies

$$\|I_t - \nabla K_t^*\|_{m;\kappa} \leq \frac{C_m}{\varrho} \mathcal{B}_m \quad (9.193)$$

for  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $t \in [0, \delta]$ .

As  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$  is a Lagrangian torus for  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa$ , we get

$$\forall y \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}, \quad \tilde{h}_t(x+y, \omega) - \tilde{h}_t(x, \omega) = \int_{l_t(x,y)} \sigma \quad (9.194)$$

where  $l_t(x, y) = \{(x+sy, \tilde{F}_t(p(x+sy), \omega)) : 0 \leq s \leq 1\}$  and  $\sigma$  is the pull-back to  $\Lambda_t(\omega)$  of the fundamental one-form  $Idx$ . The integral in (9.194) is equal to

$$\int_{l_t(x,y)} \sigma = \int_0^1 \langle \tilde{F}_t(p(x+sy), \omega), y \rangle ds = \langle \tilde{F}_t(p(x), \omega), y \rangle + O(y^2),$$

and we obtain  $\nabla_x \tilde{h}(x, \omega) = \tilde{F}_t(p(x), \omega)$  for any  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa$ . In particular, the function  $\nabla_x \tilde{h}_t(x, \omega)$  is 1-periodic with respect to  $x$  and using (9.194) we get

$$\forall \omega \in \Omega_\kappa, \forall m \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}, \quad \tilde{h}_t(x+m, \omega) - \tilde{h}_t(x, \omega) = \tilde{h}_t(m, \omega) - \tilde{h}_t(0, \omega) = \langle m, I_t(\omega) \rangle.$$

Consider the function

$$\tilde{h}_t^0(x, \omega) = \tilde{h}_t(x, \omega) - \langle x, I_t(\omega) \rangle.$$

It is 1-periodic with respect to  $x$  for  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa$  and  $\tilde{h}_t^0$  satisfies the estimates (9.192) in  $[0, \delta] \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \Omega$ . We are going to average  $\tilde{h}_t^0$  on  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1}$  using the following

**Lemma 9.13** *There exists  $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n-1})$  with  $\text{supp } f \subset [\pi, 7\pi]^{n-1}$  such that*

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}} f(x - 2\pi k) = 1$$

for each  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ .

Consider the function

$$h_t^0(x, \omega) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}} (f\tilde{h}_t^0)(x - k, \omega).$$

It is 1-periodic with respect to  $x$  by construction and  $h_t^0(x, \omega) = \tilde{h}_t^0(x, \omega)$  for  $(x, \omega) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \Omega_\kappa$ . Moreover,  $h_t^0$  satisfies (9.192) in  $[0, \delta] \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \Omega$ . We set

$$h_t(x, \omega) = h_t^0(x, \omega) + \langle x, I_t(\omega) \rangle.$$

Recall that

$$\text{dist}(\Omega_\kappa, \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \setminus \Omega) \geq \kappa.$$

Then multiplying  $h_t^0$  and  $I_t - \nabla K_t^*$  by a suitable cut-off function which is equal to one on  $\Omega - 3\kappa/4$  and zero outside  $\Omega - \kappa/2$ , we can assume that  $h_t(x, \omega) = \langle x, \nabla K_t^*(\omega) \rangle$  and  $I_t(\omega) = \nabla K_t^*(\omega)$  outside  $\Omega - \kappa/2$  (see Lemma 9.2). This proves (ii). The statement (iii) follows from (9.192), the definition of  $h_t^0$  and (9.193).  $\square$

*Step 2. Inverting  $I_t$ .*

**Lemma 9.14** *Choosing  $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, \tau, \vartheta_0) > 0$  small enough one has the following for each  $t \in [0, \delta]$ .*

1. *The map  $I_t : \Omega \rightarrow D_t$  is a diffeomorphism and its inverse  $\omega_t : D_t \rightarrow \Omega$  satisfies the estimates  $\|\omega_t - \nabla K_t\|_{1, D_t; \kappa} \leq C_0 \epsilon \kappa$  and*

$$\|\omega_t - \nabla K_t\|_{m, D_t; \kappa} \leq \frac{C_m}{\varrho} \mathcal{B}_m \lambda^m (\lambda + \|\partial^2 K_t\|_{m, D_t; \kappa}) \quad (9.195)$$

for any  $m \in \mathbb{N}_*$ . Moreover,  $\omega_t = \nabla K_t$  outside the set  $\overline{D}_t^1 := \nabla K_t^*(\Omega - \kappa/2)$ .

2. *For any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  the map  $\Omega \ni \omega \rightarrow \nabla_x h_t(x, \omega) \in D_t$  is a diffeomorphism.*

*Proof.* We are going to show that the map  $\Omega \ni \omega \rightarrow I_t(\omega)$  is a diffeomorphism. To this end we write

$$I_t = (\text{id} + \varphi_t) \circ \nabla K_t^*, \quad \varphi_t := (I_t - \nabla K_t^*) \circ \nabla K_t.$$

Moreover, Lemma 9.12, (9.184) and (9.185) imply

$$\|\varphi_t\|_{C^1} \leq \|I_t - \nabla K_t^*\|_{C^1} (1 + \|\nabla K_t\|_{C^1}) \leq C_1 \epsilon \lambda^{-2}$$

where  $C = C(n, \tau, \vartheta_0) > 0$ . Recall that  $I_t = \nabla K_t^*$  outside  $\Omega - \kappa/2$ , hence  $\text{supp } \varphi_t \subset D_t$ . Then choosing  $0 < \epsilon < 1/(2C)$  and applying Proposition A.11 we obtain that  $\text{id} + \varphi_t : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  is invertible and that  $(\text{id} + \varphi_t)^{-1} = \text{id} + \psi_t$ , where  $\text{supp } \psi_t \subset D_t$ . Hence,  $I_t(\Omega) = D_t$  and  $I_t : \Omega \rightarrow D_t$  is a diffeomorphism with inverse

$$\omega_t = \nabla K_t \circ (\text{id} + \psi_t) : D_t \rightarrow \Omega.$$

**Lemma 9.15** *For any  $m \in \mathbb{N}_*$  there exists  $C_m > 0$  depending only on  $m, n, \tau$  and  $\vartheta_0$  such that*

$$\|\varphi_t\|_{m,\kappa} \leq \frac{C_m}{\varrho} \mathcal{B}_m \lambda^{m-1} (\lambda + \|\partial^2 K_t\|_{m-1,D_t;\kappa}).$$

*Proof.* The support of  $\varphi_t$  is contained in the closure of  $D_t^1 := \nabla K_t^*(\Omega - \kappa/2)$ . Set  $2r_t := \text{dist}(D_t^1, \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \setminus D_t)$  and fix  $I^0$  in  $\overline{D}_t^1$ . Applying Remark A.6 to the restriction of  $K_t$  to the closed ball  $\overline{B}(I^0, r_t)$  as well as the Proposition A.9, 2, (9.184) and (9.185) one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_\theta^\alpha (\kappa \partial_I)^\beta \varphi_t(\theta, I)| &\leq C'_m \left(1 + \|\partial^2 K_t\|_{C^0(D_t)}^{m-1}\right) \\ &\times \left(\|I_t - \nabla K_t^*\|_{m,\kappa} \|\partial^2 K_t\|_{C^0(D_t)} + \|I_t - \nabla K_t^*\|_{C^1} \|\partial^2 K_t\|_{m-1,D_t;\kappa}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{C_m}{\varrho} \mathcal{B}_m \lambda^{m-1} (\lambda + \|\partial^2 K_t\|_{m-1,D_t;\kappa}), \end{aligned}$$

for  $(\theta, I, t) \in \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times B(I^0, r_t) \times [0, \delta]$  and  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^{n-1}$ ,  $|\alpha| + |\beta| = m \in \mathbb{N}_*$ , where  $C'_m > 0$  depends only on  $m$  and  $n$  and  $C_m > 0$  depends only on  $m, n, \tau$  and  $\vartheta_0$ . On the other hand,  $\varphi_t = 0$  outside  $D_t^1$  which completes the proof of the Lemma. This argument will be used many times in the sequel.  $\square$

Proposition A.11 applied to  $\text{id} + \kappa^{-1} \varphi_t \circ \sigma_\kappa$  implies that  $\text{supp } \psi_t \subset \overline{D}_t^1$ ,  $\|\psi_t\|_{C^0} \leq C_0 \epsilon / \lambda$  and

$$\|\psi_t\|_{m,\kappa} \leq \frac{C_m}{\varrho} \mathcal{B}_m \lambda^{m-1} (\lambda + \|\partial^2 K_t\|_{m-1,D_t;\kappa})$$

for  $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$ . In particular,  $\|d\psi_t\|_{C^0} \leq C_1 \epsilon$ . Consider

$$\omega_t(I) - \nabla K_t(I) = \int_0^1 d(\nabla K_t)(I + s\psi_t(I)) \psi_t(I) ds, \quad I \in D_t.$$

The support of  $\omega_t - \nabla K_t$  is contained in  $\overline{D}_t^1$ . Moreover,  $\|\omega_t - \nabla K_t\|_{C^0(D_t)} \leq C_0 \epsilon \kappa$  and arguing as in the proof of Lemma 9.15 one obtains for any  $m \in \mathbb{N}_*$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{n-1}$  with  $|\alpha| = m$  the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\kappa \partial)^\alpha (\omega_t - \nabla K_t)\|_{C^0} &\leq C_m \|\partial^2 K_t\|_{C^0(D_t)} \|\psi_t\|_{m,\kappa} \\ &+ C_m \|\psi_t\|_{C^0} (1 + \|d\psi_t\|_{C^0}^{m-1}) (\|\partial^2 K_t\|_{1,D_t;\kappa} \|d\psi_t\|_{m-1,\kappa} + \|\partial^2 K_t\|_{m,D_t;\kappa} \|d\psi_t\|_{C^0(D_t)}). \end{aligned}$$

Then using (9.184), (9.185) and the previous estimates we obtain (9.195). The estimate  $\|d\omega_t - d\nabla K_t\|_{C^0(D_t)} \leq C \epsilon \lambda$  follows from (9.195) with  $m = 1$  and (9.185). We are going to prove that for each  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  the map  $\Omega \ni \omega \rightarrow \nabla_x h_t(x, \omega)$  is a diffeomorphism. To this end we fix  $x$  and we write the map  $\omega \rightarrow \nabla_x h_t(x, \omega)$  as follows

$$\nabla_x h_t = (\text{id} + \varphi_t^1) \circ \nabla K_t^*, \quad \varphi_t^1 := (\nabla_x h_t^0 + I_t - \nabla K_t^*) \circ \nabla K_t.$$

Then  $\text{supp } \varphi_t^1 \subset \overline{D}_t^1$  and

$$\|\varphi_t^1\|_{C^1} \leq (\|\nabla_x h_t^0\|_{C^1} + \|I_t - \nabla K_t^*\|_{C^1}) (1 + \|\partial^2 K_t\|_{C^0}) \leq C_1 \epsilon / \lambda$$

and we complete the proof of 2 as above.  $\square$

*Step 3. Construction of  $\chi_t$ .* The second statement of the Lemma implies that there is a  $C^\infty$ -foliation of  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times D_t$  by Lagrangian tori

$$\Lambda_t(\omega) = \{(p(x), \nabla_x h_t(x, \omega)) : x \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}\}, \quad \omega \in \Omega$$

which is a smooth extension of the family of the Kronecker invariant tori (9.190) of  $P_t$ . Notice that  $I_t(\omega)$  is the action along the basis of cycles  $[\gamma_{t,j}(\omega)], \dots, [\gamma_{t,n-1}(\omega)]$  of  $H_1(\Lambda_t(\omega), \mathbb{R})$ , where  $\gamma_{t,j}(\omega) = \{(p(se_j), \nabla_x h_t(se_j, \omega)) : 0 \leq s \leq 1\}$ . Indeed, it follows from the definition of  $h_t$  that  $I_t(\omega) = \nabla_x h_t(x, \omega) - \nabla_x h_t^0(x, \omega)$ , where  $h_t^0$  is 1-periodic in  $x$  and we obtain

$$I_t(\omega) = \left( \int_{\gamma_{t,1}(\omega)} \sigma, \dots, \int_{\gamma_{t,n-1}(\omega)} \sigma \right) \quad (9.196)$$

for  $\omega \in \Omega$ . Now we set  $\Phi_t(x, I) = h_t(x, \omega_t(I))$ . Then

$$\Phi_t^0(x, I) := \langle x, I \rangle - \Phi_t(x, I) = -h_t^0(x, \omega_t(I))$$

is 1-periodic with respect to  $x$ , and it has a compact support in  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times D_t$ . Moreover, it follows from Lemma 9.12, Lemma 9.14, Remark A.6 and Proposition A.7 that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi_t^0\|_{m, \mathbb{A}_t; \kappa} &\leq C_m \left( 1 + \|d\omega_t\|_{C^0(D_t)}^{m-1} \right) \left( \|h_t^0\|_{m, \kappa} \|d\omega_t\|_{C^0(D_t)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|h_t^0\|_{1, \kappa} \|\partial^2 K_t\|_{m-1, D_t; \kappa} + \|h_t^0\|_{1, \kappa} \|(d\omega_t - d\nabla K_t)\|_{m-1, D_t; \kappa} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{C_m}{\varrho} \mathcal{B}_m \lambda^{2m-2} (\lambda + \|\partial^2 K_t\|_{m, D_t; \kappa}) \end{aligned}$$

for  $t \in [0, \delta]$  and  $m \in \mathbb{N}_*$ , where  $C_m$  depends only on  $m, n, \tau$  and  $\vartheta_0$ . This implies

$$\|\sigma_\kappa^{-1} \text{sgrad} \Phi_t^0\|_{m, \mathbb{A}_t; \kappa} \leq \frac{C_m}{\kappa \varrho} \mathcal{B}_{m+1} \lambda^{2m} (\lambda + \|\partial^2 K_t\|_{m+1, D_t; \kappa}) \quad (9.197)$$

for  $t \in [0, \delta]$  and  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , where  $C_m$  depends only on  $m, n, \tau$  and  $\vartheta_0$ . In particular, one obtains by means of (9.184) and (9.185) that

$$\|\sigma_\kappa^{-1} \text{sgrad} \Phi_t^0\|_{1, \mathbb{A}_t; \kappa} \leq c\epsilon/\lambda \quad (9.198)$$

for  $t \in [0, \delta]$ , where  $c = c(n, \tau, \vartheta_0) > 0$ . Using Lemma A.12 we obtain

**Lemma 9.16** *Choosing  $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, \tau, \vartheta_0) > 0$  small enough we have the following*

1.  $\Phi_t$  is a generating function of a symplectic transformation  $\chi_t : \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times D_t \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times D_t$  and the map  $[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow \chi_t \in C^\infty(\mathbb{A}_t, \mathbb{A}_t)$  is  $C^1$ ;
2.  $\chi_t(\Lambda_t(\omega)) = \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \{I_t(\omega)\}$  for any  $\omega \in \Omega$  and  $t \in [0, \delta]$ ;
3.  $\chi_t - \text{id}$  and  $\chi_t^{-1} - \text{id}$  are compactly supported in  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \overline{D}_t^1$ , where  $D_t^1 = \nabla K_t^*(\Omega - \kappa/2)$  and they satisfy the estimates (9.186). Moreover,

$$\|\sigma_\kappa^{-1}(\chi - \text{id})\|_{1, \mathbb{A}_t; \kappa} + \|\sigma_\kappa^{-1}(\chi - \text{id})\|_{1, \mathbb{A}_t; \kappa} \leq c\epsilon/\lambda.$$

*Proof.* Using Lemma A.12 one obtains a symplectic transformation  $\chi_t : \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times D_t \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  defined by

$$\chi_t(\nabla_I \Phi_t(\theta, I), I) = (\theta, \nabla_\theta \Phi_t(\theta, I)), \quad (\theta, I) \in \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}.$$

Notice that the map

$$D_t \ni I \rightarrow \nabla_\theta \Phi_t(\theta, I) = I + \nabla_\theta h_t^0(\theta, \omega_t(I)) \in D_t$$

is a diffeomorphism since the map  $\Omega \ni \omega \rightarrow I_t(\omega) + \nabla_\theta h_t^0(\theta, \omega) = \nabla_\theta h_t(\theta, \omega) \in D_t$  is a diffeomorphism in view of Lemma 9.14, 2, hence,  $\chi_t(\mathbb{A}_t) = \mathbb{A}_t$ . For any  $\omega \in \Omega$  and any  $\theta$  we have

$$(\theta, \nabla h_t(\theta, \omega)) = (\theta, \nabla_\theta \Phi_t(\theta, I_t(\omega))) = \chi_t(\nabla_I \Phi_t(\theta, I_t(\omega)), I_t(\omega)).$$

hence,  $\Lambda_t(\omega) = \chi_t(\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \{I_t(\omega)\})$ . Moreover,  $\chi_t(\varphi, I_t(\omega)) = (\varphi, I_t(\omega)) = (\varphi, \nabla K_t^*(\omega))$  if  $\text{dist}(\omega, \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \setminus \Omega) \leq \kappa/2$ , hence, the support of both  $\chi_t - \text{id}$  and  $\chi_t^{-1} - \text{id}$  is contained in  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \overline{D}_t^1$ . The estimate (9.186) follows from (9.197) and Lemma A.12.  $\square$

*Step 4. Estimates.* Consider the exact symplectic map  $P_t^0 = \chi_t^{-1} P_t \chi_t$ . Using Lemma A.14 we write  $P_t$  in as the composition  $P_t = W_t Q_t$ , where  $W_t$  is the exact symplectic map defined by the generating function  $(x, r) \rightarrow \langle x, r \rangle - G_t(x, r)$  and  $Q_t(\theta, r) = (\theta + \nabla K(r), r)$ . Then

$$P_t^0 = W_t^1 Q_t,$$

where

$$W_t^0 = \chi_t^{-1} W_t + \chi_t^{-1} W_t Q_t (\chi_t^{-1} - \text{id}) Q_t^{-1}.$$

**Lemma 9.17** *The exact symplectic map  $W_t^1$ ,  $t \in [0, \delta]$ , admits a generating function of the form*

$$(x, I) \rightarrow \langle x, I \rangle - G_t^1(x, I)$$

*such that the map  $[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow G_t^1 \in C^\infty(\mathbb{A})$  is  $C^1$ ,  $\text{supp}(dG_t^1) \subset \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \overline{D}_t^1$  and*

$$\|\sigma_\kappa^{-1} \text{sgrad } G_t^1\|_{m, \mathbb{A}_t; \kappa} \leq \frac{C_m}{\varrho \kappa} \mathcal{B}_{m+1} \lambda^{2m} (\lambda + \|\partial^2 K_t\|_{m+1, D_t; \kappa})$$

*for any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , where  $C_m$  depends only on  $m, n, \tau$  and  $\vartheta_0$ .*

*Proof.* We have

$$\begin{aligned} W_t^1 - \text{id} &= (W_t - \text{id} + (\chi_t^{-1} - \text{id}) W_t) + (Q_t(\chi_t - \text{id}) Q_t^{-1}) \\ &+ (W_t - \text{id} + (\chi_t^{-1} - \text{id}) W_t) \circ (Q_t(\chi_t - \text{id}) Q_t^{-1}). \end{aligned} \tag{9.199}$$

We estimate the  $C^m$  norms of it term by term. Notice that the support of each term is contained in  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \overline{D}_t^1$ .

Lemma A.12 and (9.185) imply  $\|\sigma_\kappa^{-1}(W_t - \text{id})\|_{1, \mathbb{A}_t; \kappa} < C\epsilon/\lambda$  and

$$\|\sigma_\kappa^{-1}(W_t - \text{id})\|_{m, \mathbb{A}_t; \kappa} \leq \frac{C_m}{\varrho \kappa} \mathcal{B}_m.$$

The last estimate, Lemma 9.16, 3, and Lemma A.9, 2, imply

$$\|\sigma_\kappa^{-1}(\chi_t^{-1} - \text{id})W_t\|_{m, \mathbb{A}_t; \kappa} \leq \frac{C_m}{\varrho\kappa} \mathcal{B}_{m+1} \lambda^{2m} (\lambda + \|\partial^2 K_t\|_{m+1, D_t; \kappa}).$$

and

$$\|\sigma_\kappa^{-1}(\chi^{-1} - \text{id})W_t\|_{1, \mathbb{A}_t; \kappa} \leq c\epsilon/\lambda.$$

Using the argument in the proof of Lemma 9.15 first to  $(\chi_t - \text{id})Q_t^{-1}$  and then to  $Q_t(\chi_t - \text{id})Q_t^{-1}$  we obtain the estimate

$$\|\sigma_\kappa^{-1}Q_t(\chi_t - \text{id})Q_t^{-1}\|_{m, \mathbb{A}_t; \kappa} \leq \frac{C_m}{\varrho\kappa} \mathcal{B}_{m+1} \lambda^{2m} (\lambda + \|\partial^2 K_t\|_{m+1, D_t; \kappa}).$$

This yields the estimate of the first line of (9.199). To obtain the estimates for the composition in the second line one uses the preceding estimates and the argument of Lemma 9.15. It remains to apply Lemma A.12 in order to complete the proof of the Lemma.  $\square$

*Step 4. Proof of (i).* Now Lemma A.14 implies that the function  $\tilde{G}_t^0(x, I) = \langle x, I \rangle - K_t(I) - G_t^1(\varphi, I)$  is a generating function of  $P_t^0$ . The function  $\tilde{G}_t^0$  is uniquely defined modulo a constant depending only on  $t$  which is chosen appropriately in order to obtain a  $C^1$ -smooth the map  $t \rightarrow \tilde{G}_t^0$ . Set  $L_t(I) := K_t(I) - G_t^1(0, I)$  and  $R_t(\theta, I) = G_t^1(\theta, I) - G_t^1(0, I)$ . We have

$$P_t^0(\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \{I_t(\omega)\}) = (\chi_t^{-1} \circ P_t)(\Lambda_t(\omega)) = \chi_t^{-1}(\Lambda_t(\omega)) = \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \{I_t(\omega)\}$$

for any  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa$ , which implies

$$I_t(\omega) - \nabla_x R_t^0(x, I_t(\omega)) = \nabla_x \tilde{G}_t^0(x, I_t(\omega)) = I_t(\omega)$$

for any such  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ . On the other hand,  $R_t^0(0, I) = 0$ , hence,  $R_t^0(\theta, I) = 0$  on  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times E_{t, \kappa}$ , where  $E_{t, \kappa} := I_t(\Omega_\kappa)$ . Now Lemma 6.3 implies that  $\partial_I^\beta R_t^0(\theta, I) = 0$  for any  $(\theta, I) \in \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times E_{t, \kappa}^0$ , where  $E_{t, \kappa}^0 := I_t(\Omega_\kappa^0)$  is the set of points of positive Lebesgue density in  $E_{t, \kappa}$ . Now  $P_t^0(\theta + \nabla L_t(I), I) = (\theta, I)$  on  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times E_{t, \kappa}^0$ , and we obtain that  $\nabla_I L_t(I_t(\omega)) = \omega$  for each  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$ . Then  $\nabla L_t^*(\omega) = I_t(\omega)$  for each  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa^0$  and it satisfies (1.6) according to (9.196). The estimates of the derivatives of  $L_t$  and  $R_t^0$  follow from that of Lemma 9.17.  $\square$

## 10 KAM theorem with parameters

The theorems formulated above follow from a KAM theorem with parameters. A complete and very comprehensive proof of it has been given by Pöschel [47] and Kuksin [35] in the analytic case. It can be extended to the case of smooth Hamiltonians using suitable approximation and inverse approximation lemmas. In the case of Gevrey Hamiltonians this has been done in [52]. The advantage of this approach is that frequencies are separated from action variables which makes it easier to obtain smoothness with respect to the frequencies and the additional parameters as well as to prove suitable Hölder estimates on the transformations putting the Hamiltonian to a normal form. The normal form of the Hamiltonian is  $N(I; \omega) := \langle \omega, I \rangle$ . The perturbation is a real valued function  $(\theta, I; \omega, t) \mapsto P(\theta, I; \omega, t)$  defined in  $\mathbb{A}^n \times \Omega \times [0, a]$ , where

$\mathbb{A}^n := \mathbb{T}^n \times B(0, \rho_0)$ ,  $B(0, \rho_0) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is the ball centered at  $I = 0$  with radius  $\rho_0 \in (0, 1]$  and  $\Omega$  is a bounded domain in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Hereafter, we assume that

$$P \in C^k([0, a]; C_0^\infty(\mathbb{A}^n \times \Omega)) \quad (10.200)$$

with  $k = 0$  or  $k = 1$ , i.e. the map  $t \rightarrow P_t := P(\cdot, t) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{T}^n \times B(0, \rho_0) \times \Omega)$  is  $C^k$ -smooth on the interval  $[0, a]$ . This means that the support of the function  $(I, \omega) \rightarrow P(\theta, I; \omega, t)$  is contained in a fixed compact subset of  $B(0, \rho_0) \times \Omega$  independent of  $(\theta, t) \in \mathbb{T}^n \times [0, a]$  and that the maps

$$t \rightarrow P_t := \partial_t^j P(\cdot, t) \in C^p(\mathbb{T}^n \times B(0, \rho_0) \times \Omega)$$

are continuous in  $t \in [0, a]$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k$  and  $p \in \mathbb{N}$ . Given  $\ell > 0$  and  $0 < r, \kappa \leq 1$  we denote by  $\|P_t\|_{\ell; r, \kappa}$  the weighted Hölder norm

$$\|P_t\|_{\ell; r, \kappa} := \|P_t \circ \sigma_{r, \kappa}\|_{C^\ell(\sigma_{r, \kappa}^{-1}(\mathbb{A}^n \times \Omega))} \quad (10.201)$$

where  $\sigma_{r, \kappa}$  is the partial dilation  $\sigma_{r, \kappa}(\varphi, I; \omega) := (\varphi, rI; \kappa\omega)$ . The Hölder norms are defined in Section A.1 (see also [46]).

Fix  $0 < \vartheta_0 \leq 1$  such that  $2\tau + \vartheta_0$  is not an integer and set

$$\ell_0 := 2\tau + 2 + \vartheta_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \ell(m) := 2m(\tau + 1) + \ell_0, \quad m \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (10.202)$$

Denote the Hamiltonian vector field associated to the Hamiltonian  $(\theta, I) \rightarrow N(I; \omega) = \langle \omega, I \rangle$  by  $\mathcal{L}_\omega := X_N(\cdot, \omega) = \langle \omega, \partial/\partial\theta \rangle$ . We consider  $C^k$ -families,  $k = 0, 1$ , of Hamiltonians  $t \rightarrow H_{t, \omega}$ ,  $t \in [0, \delta]$ , where

$$H_{t, \omega}(\theta, I) := H(\theta, I; \omega, t) = N(I; \omega) + P(\theta, I; \omega, t)$$

and  $P$  satisfies (10.200). The following theorem is an analogue of Theorem A in [47].

**Theorem 10.1** *There is a positive constant  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(n, \tau, \vartheta_0) > 0$  depending only on  $n, \tau$  and on  $\vartheta_0$  such that for any  $a > 0$ ,  $0 < \kappa < 1$  and  $0 < r < \rho_0$  and for any real valued Hamiltonian of the form  $H = \mathcal{N} + P$  with  $\mathcal{N}(I; \omega) = \langle \omega, I \rangle$  and  $P$  satisfying (10.200) with  $k \in \{0, 1\}$  and such that*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, a]} \|P_t\|_{\ell_0; r, \kappa} \leq \varepsilon \kappa r, \quad (10.203)$$

*the following holds:*

*There is a  $C^k$  family of maps*

$$[0, a] \ni t \mapsto \phi_t \in C^\infty(\Omega; \Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad [0, a] \ni t \mapsto \Psi_t = (U_t, V_t) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^n \times \Omega; \mathbb{T}^n \times B(0, r))$$

*such that  $\text{supp}(\phi_t - \text{id}) \subset \Omega - \kappa/2$ ,  $\text{supp}((U_t, V_t) - (\text{id}, 0)) \subset \mathbb{T}^n \times (\Omega - \kappa/2)$ , and*

- (i) For each  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa$  and  $t \in [0, a]$  the map  $\Psi_{t, \omega} := \Psi_t(\cdot, \omega) : \mathbb{T}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n \times B(0, r)$  is a smooth embedding,  $\Lambda_t(\omega) := \Psi_{t, \omega}(\mathbb{T}^n)$  is an embedded Lagrangian torus invariant with respect to the Hamiltonian flow of  $H_{t, \phi_t(\omega)}(\theta, I) := H(\theta, I; \phi_t(\omega), t)$ , and*

$$X_{H_{t, \phi_t(\omega)}} \circ \Psi_{t, \omega} = D\Psi_{t, \omega} \cdot \mathcal{L}_\omega \quad \text{on } \mathbb{T}^n,$$

(ii) For any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  there is  $C_m > 0$  depending only on  $m, n, \tau$  and  $\vartheta_0$  such that for any  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^n$  of length  $|\alpha| + |\beta| \leq m$  and  $0 \leq q \leq k$  the following estimate holds

$$\left| \partial_\theta^\alpha (\kappa \partial_\omega)^\beta \partial_t^q (U_t(\theta; \omega) - \theta) \right| + r^{-1} \left| \partial_\theta^\alpha (\kappa \partial_\omega)^\beta \partial_t^q V_t(\theta; \omega) \right| + \kappa^{-1} \left| (\kappa \partial_\omega)^\beta \partial_t^q (\phi_t(\omega) - \omega) \right|$$

$$\leq C_m (\kappa r)^{-1} \sup_{0 \leq p \leq q} \sup_{t \in [0, a]} \|\partial_t^p P_t\|_{\ell(m); r, \kappa}$$

uniformly in  $(\theta, \omega, t) \in \mathbb{T}^n \times \Omega \times [0, a]$ .

For each  $t \in [0, \delta]$  and  $\omega \in \Omega$  denote by

$$\Phi_{t, \omega}^s := \exp(s X_{H_{t, \omega}}), \quad s \in \mathbb{R},$$

the flow of the Hamiltonian vector field  $X_{H_{t, \omega}}$  of the Hamiltonian  $H_{t, \omega}$  and set

$$g_\omega^s(\theta) = \theta + p(s\omega), \quad \theta \in \mathbb{T}^n, \quad s \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \omega \in \Omega,$$

where  $p : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n$  is the canonical projection.

**Remark 10.2** The assertion (i) of Theorem 10.1 means that for each  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa$  the family  $[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow \Lambda_t(\omega)$  is a  $C^k$  family of Kronecker invariant tori with respect to the flow  $\Phi_{t, \tilde{\omega}}^s$ , where  $\tilde{\omega} = \phi_t(\omega)$ . More precisely, for each  $t \in [0, \delta]$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa$ , and  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ , the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{T}^n & \xrightarrow{g_\omega^s} & \mathbb{T}^n \\ \downarrow \Psi_{t, \omega} & & \downarrow \Psi_{t, \omega} \\ \Lambda_t(\omega) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{t, \tilde{\omega}}^s} & \Lambda_t(\omega) \end{array}$$

is commutative.

**Remark 10.3** -

1. The Theorem holds for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  (then  $C_m$  depends on  $k$  as well). We suppose here that  $k = 0, 1$  to simplify the proof.

2. We point out that the constant  $\varepsilon > 0$  does not depend on the parameters  $\kappa$  and  $r$ , the domain  $\Omega$ , the annulus  $\mathbb{A}^n = \mathbb{T}^n \times B(0, \rho_0)$ , the interval  $[0, a]$ , as well as on the particular Hamiltonian  $H$  satisfying (10.200) and (10.203).

3. (i) still holds if  $P \in C^k([0, 1]; C_0^{\ell_0}(\mathbb{A}^n \times \Omega))$ . Then  $t \rightarrow \Psi_{t, \omega}$  is a  $C^k$  map with values in  $C^q(\mathbb{T}^n, \mathbb{A}^n)$ ,  $1 < q < 1 + \vartheta_0$ , which agrees with the KAM theorem for Hölder Hamiltonians first proved by Moser (cf. [46] Theorem A, [60] Theorem 2 and [59] Theorem 2).

(ii) still holds if  $P \in C^k([0, 1]; C_0^{\ell(m)}(\mathbb{A}^n \times \Omega))$ . Better estimates for the derivatives of  $U_t$  and  $V_t$  could be obtained following [46] as in [50] and [51]. Here we prefer the method given by Pöschel in [47] since it makes it easier to follow along the proof the dependence of  $\Psi_t$  with respect to the parameters  $\kappa, r$  and  $t \in [0, 1]$ .

The proof of the theorem is organized as follows. In Sect. 11.1 we prove the KAM Lemma and choose the parameters for the next iteration. The KAM Lemma is close to that of Pöschel in [47] but one needs additional arguments to estimate the derivatives with respect  $t$ . To this end we give a complete prove of it skipping some details. In Sect. A.1 we recall the Approximation

and the Inverse Approximation Lemma. In Sect. 11.2 we iterate the KAM Step infinitely many times. The choice of the parameters leads to an exponentially converging scheme. Additional efforts are needed to get convergence for the derivatives with respect to  $t$  and to obtain the corresponding estimates in the Iterative Lemma. In Sect. 11.3 we prove (i). In Sect. 11.4 we state a suitable Whitney extension theorem and prove an Inverse Approximation Lemma which implies (ii).

## 11 Proof of Theorem 10.1

### 11.1 The KAM Step

#### 11.1.1 The KAM Lemma

Given two domains  $D_j \subset \mathbb{C}^{n_j}$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ , we denote by  $\mathcal{A}(D_1, D_2)$  the space of analytic maps  $f : D_1 \rightarrow D_2$  equipped by the inductive topology generated by the sup-norms on compact sets of  $D_1$ , and by  $C^k([0, a], \mathcal{A}(D_1, D_2))$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , the corresponding space of the  $C^k$  functions. If  $D_2 = \mathbb{C}$  we write  $\mathcal{A}(D_1) := \mathcal{A}(D_1, \mathbb{C})$ . Introduce the complex domains

$$D_{s,r} = \{\theta \in \mathbb{C}^n / \mathbb{Z}^n : |\operatorname{Im} \theta| < s\} \times \{I \in \mathbb{C}^n : |I| < r\},$$

$$O_h = \{\omega \in \mathbb{C}^n : |\omega - \Omega_\kappa| < h\}.$$

The sup-norm of functions in  $\mathcal{V} := D_{s,r} \times O_h$  will be denoted by  $|\cdot|_{s,r,h}$  and the corresponding space of analytic functions in  $\mathcal{V}$  by  $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{V})$ . We state below a variant of the KAM Lemma following Pöschel [47]. It involves several parameters

$$0 < s, r < 1, \quad 0 < \eta < 1/8, \quad 0 < \sigma < s/5, \quad K \geq 1, \quad (11.204)$$

a positive constant  $c_0 = c_0(n, \tau) \leq 1$  depending only on  $n$  and  $\tau$  and a small parameter  $\varepsilon > 0$  satisfying the following inequalities

$$(a) \quad \varepsilon \leq c_0 \kappa \eta r \sigma^{\tau+1},$$

$$(b) \quad \varepsilon \leq c_0 h r,$$

$$(c) \quad h \leq \frac{\kappa}{2K^{\tau+1}}.$$

Moreover, we will require below the inequality

$$(d) \quad h \leq \kappa \sigma^{\tau+1}$$

which follows from (c) provided that  $K\sigma \geq 1$ . Fix  $k \in \{0, 1\}$ .

**Proposition 11.1 (KAM Step).** *There is a positive constant  $c_0 = c_0(n, \tau) \leq 1$  depending only on  $n$  and  $\tau$  such that for any  $a > 0$  and  $s, r, \eta, \sigma, K$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  satisfying (11.204) and (a)-(c), and for every real valued Hamiltonian  $H = N + P$ , where*

$$N(I; \omega, t) = e(\omega, t) + \langle \omega, I \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad P \in C^k([0, a], \mathcal{A}(D_{s,r} \times O_h))$$

*satisfies the estimate*

$$\sup_{0 \leq j \leq k} \sup_{t \in [0, a]} |\partial_t^j P_t|_{s,r,h} \leq \varepsilon \quad (11.205)$$

*the following holds.*

(1) There exists a  $C^k$  family of real analytic transformation  $\mathcal{F} = (\Phi, \phi)$ , where

$$\Phi \in C^k([0, a], \mathcal{A}(D_{s-5\sigma, \eta r} \times O_{h/4}, D_{s, r})) \quad \text{and} \quad \phi \in C^k([0, a], \mathcal{A}(O_{h/4}, O_h))$$

such that  $H \circ \mathcal{F} = N_+ + P_+$  with

$$N_+(I; \omega, t) = e_+(\omega, t) + \langle \omega, I \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad P_+ \in C^k([0, a], \mathcal{A}(D_{s-5\sigma, \eta r} \times O_{h/4}))$$

satisfying the estimate

$$|\partial_t^p P_+(\cdot, t)|_{s-5\sigma, \eta r, h/4} \leq C_0 \left( \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\kappa r \sigma^{\tau+1}} + (\eta^2 + \sigma^{-n} e^{-K\sigma}) \varepsilon \right) \quad (11.206)$$

for any  $t \in [0, a]$  and  $0 \leq p \leq k$ , where  $C_0 = C_0(n, \tau)$  is a positive constant depending only on  $n$  and  $\tau$ ,

(2)  $\Phi(\theta, I; \omega, t) = (U(\theta; \omega, t), V(\theta, I; \omega, t))$ , where  $V$  is affine linear with respect to  $I$  and the transformation  $(\theta, I) \rightarrow \Phi(\theta, I; \omega, t)$  is canonical for each  $(\omega, t)$  fixed. Moreover,  $\Phi$  and  $\phi$  satisfy the estimates

$$\begin{aligned} |W \partial_t^p (\sigma \partial_\theta)^\alpha (r \partial_I)^\beta (\Phi(\theta, I; \omega, t) - (\theta, I; \omega, t))| &\leq C_{\alpha, \beta} \frac{\varepsilon}{\kappa r \sigma^{\tau+1}}, \\ |\partial_t^p (h \partial_\omega)^\gamma (\phi(\omega, t) - \omega)| &\leq C_\gamma \frac{\varepsilon}{r}, \end{aligned}$$

for any  $0 \leq p \leq k$  and  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{N}^n$  uniformly on  $D_{s-5\sigma, \eta r} \times O_h \times [0, a]$  and  $O_{h/4} \times [0, a]$ , respectively, where  $W = \text{diag}(\sigma^{-1} \text{Id}, r^{-1} \text{Id})$  and  $C_{\alpha, \beta}$  and  $C_\gamma$  are positive constant depending only on  $n, \tau, \alpha, \beta$  and on  $\gamma$  respectively.

**Remark 11.2** 1. To obtain (d) we will choose  $K$  and  $\sigma$  so that  $K\sigma > 1$ . Then one can replace  $\sigma^{-n} e^{-K\sigma}$  by  $K^{-n} e^{-K\sigma}$  in (11.206) as in [47], Sect. 4.

2. Set  $\overline{W} = \text{diag}(\sigma^{-1} \text{Id}, r^{-1} \text{Id}, h^{-1} \text{Id})$  and suppose that (d) holds, i.e.  $h \leq \kappa \sigma^{\tau+1}$ . Then (2) and the Cauchy estimate of the derivatives of  $\Phi$  with respect to  $\omega$  yield

$$|\overline{W} \partial_t^p (\sigma \partial_\theta)^\alpha (r \partial_I)^\beta (h \partial_\omega)^\gamma (\mathcal{F}(\theta, I; \omega, t) - (\theta, I; \omega, t))| \leq C_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma} \frac{\varepsilon}{r h}$$

for  $0 \leq p \leq 1$  uniformly on  $D_{s-5\sigma, \eta r} \times O_{h/4} \times [0, a]$ , where  $C_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma} > 0$  depends only on  $n, \tau, \alpha, \beta$  and  $\gamma$ . In particular,

$$|\overline{W} \partial_t^p (D\mathcal{F}(\cdot, t) - \text{Id}) \overline{W}^{-1}| \leq C_0 \frac{\varepsilon}{r h}$$

where  $D\mathcal{F}(\cdot, t)$  stands for the Jacobian of  $\mathcal{F}(\cdot, t)$ .

**Remark 11.3** Hereafter we use the Cauchy estimates for analytic functions in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  (see for example Theorem 2.2.7, [26] and Appendix A in [47]). More precisely, let  $D$  be a domain in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  and  $D_r := \{z \in \mathbb{C}^n : |z - D| < r\}$ . Then for any analytic function  $f$  in  $D_r$  with a bounded sup-norm  $|f|_r := \sup_{z \in D_r} |f(z)|$  and any  $0 \leq \rho < r$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n$  one has

$$|\partial^\alpha f|_\rho \leq \alpha! (r - \rho)^{-|\alpha|-1} |f|_r. \quad (11.207)$$

We recall as well the standard estimates of the Fourier coefficients

$$f_k = \int_{\mathbb{T}^n} f(\theta) e^{-2\pi i \langle k, \theta \rangle} d\theta, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}^n,$$

of an analytic function  $f$  in a strip  $\mathbb{T}^n + s := \{\theta \in \mathbb{C}^n / \mathbb{Z}^n : |\operatorname{Im} \theta| < s\}$ ,  $s > 0$ , with a bounded sup-norm  $|f|_s$ , namely,

$$|f_k| \leq e^{-|k|s} |f|_s, \quad (11.208)$$

where  $|k| = \sum_{j=1}^n |k_j|$ .

*Proof of Proposition 11.1.* For Hamiltonians independent of  $t$  the proposition is formulated and proved in [47]. It follows easily from [47] in the case  $k = 0$ . The proof of the corresponding estimates of  $\partial_t P_t$  requires additional efforts. For this reason we give a complete proof in the case  $k = 1$  following Pöschel [47].

*Step 1. Truncation.* Consider the linear part of  $P$  with respect to  $I$

$$Q(\theta, I; \omega, t) := P(\theta, 0; \omega, t) + \langle \nabla_I P(\theta, 0; \omega, t), I \rangle.$$

Given a positive integer  $K$  we denote by

$$R(\theta, I; \omega, t) := \sum_{|k| \leq K} R_k(I; \omega, t) e^{i \langle k, \theta \rangle}$$

the trigonometric polynomial of degree  $K$  in the Fourier series expansion of  $Q$  with respect to  $\theta$ . By (11.205) and the Cauchy inequalities (11.207) one obtains the following estimates

$$|\partial_t^p Q|_{s,r} < C_0 \varepsilon, \quad |\partial_t^p (P - Q)|_{s, 2\eta r} < C_0 \eta^2 \varepsilon$$

for  $0 \leq p \leq 1$  uniformly with respect to  $(\omega, t) \in O_h \times [0, a]$  (recall that  $0 < \eta < 1/8$ ). Moreover, estimating the Fourier coefficients of  $\partial_t^p Q$  by (11.208) one obtains

$$|\partial_t^p (Q - R)|_{s-\sigma, r} < C_0 \sigma^{-n} e^{-K\sigma} \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad |\partial_t^p R|_{s-\sigma, r} < C_0 \varepsilon. \quad (11.209)$$

The Cauchy estimates imply

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_t^p (\sigma \partial_\theta)^\alpha (r \partial_I)^\beta R|_{s-2\sigma, r/2} &\leq C_{\alpha, \beta} \varepsilon \\ |\partial_t^p (\sigma \partial_\theta)^\alpha (r \partial_I)^\beta (P - R)|_{s-2\sigma, 2\eta r} &\leq C_{\alpha, \beta} (\eta^2 + \sigma^{-n} e^{-K\sigma}) \varepsilon \end{aligned} \quad (11.210)$$

for  $0 \leq p \leq 1$  uniformly in  $(\omega, t) \in O_h \times [0, a]$ . Hereafter  $C_0 \geq 1$  stands for a constant depending only on  $n$  and  $\tau$  and we denote by  $C_{\alpha, \beta}$  a positive constant depending only on  $n$ ,  $\tau$ ,  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ .

*Step 2. Homological equation.* The idea is to put  $\partial_t^p (P - R)$  in the error term and to kill  $\partial_t^p R$  by means of a canonical transformation  $\Phi$  which is the time-one-map of a Hamiltonian vector field  $X_F = (\nabla_I F, -\nabla_\theta F)$ . More precisely, consider the Hamiltonian flow

$$(x, \theta, I) \rightarrow \exp(x X_F)(\theta, I) = (u(x, \theta, I), v(x, \theta, I))$$

and set

$$\Phi = (U, V) := \exp(X_F), \quad \text{where } U(\cdot) = u(1, \cdot) \text{ and } V(\cdot) = v(1, \cdot).$$

The corresponding Hamiltonian system is

$$\begin{cases} \frac{du}{dx} = \nabla_v F(u, v; \omega, t) \\ \frac{dv}{dx} = -\nabla_u F(u, v; \omega, t) \\ u(0) = \theta, \quad v(0) = I. \end{cases} \quad (11.211)$$

The Lie method is based on the identity

$$\frac{d}{dx}(f \circ \exp(xX_F)) = \{f, F\} \circ \exp(xX_F),$$

where  $\{f, F\} = \langle \nabla_I f, \nabla_\theta F \rangle - \langle \nabla_\theta f, \nabla_I F \rangle$  is the Poisson bracket. Using Taylor's formula with respect to  $x$  at  $x = 0$  and the above identity one gets

$$\begin{aligned} (N + R) \circ \Phi &= N \circ \exp(xX_F)|_{x=1} + R \circ \exp(xX_F)|_{x=1} \\ &= N + \{N, F\} + R + \int_0^1 \{(1-x)\{N, F\} + R, F\} \circ \exp(xX_F) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (11.212)$$

We are looking for a trigonometric polynomial  $F$  of degree  $K$  and for a function  $\hat{N}$  depending only on  $(I, \omega, t)$  solving the homological equation

$$\{N, F\} + R = \hat{N}. \quad (11.213)$$

Recall that  $N(I; \omega, t) = e(\omega, t) + \langle \omega, I \rangle$ . Then (11.213) becomes  $\mathcal{L}_\omega F = \hat{N} - R$ , where  $\mathcal{L}_\omega = \langle \omega, \partial/\partial \theta \rangle$ . Take

$$\hat{N}(I; \omega, t) := R_0(I; \omega, t) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^n} R(\theta, I; \omega, t) d\theta,$$

which is affine linear in  $I$ . Then the zero order term of the trigonometric polynomial  $\hat{N} - R$  is zero which is a necessary condition for solving the above equation. On the other hand, the Diophantine condition (9.146) and (c) imply

$$|\langle \omega, k \rangle| \geq \frac{\kappa}{2|k|^\tau} \quad \text{for all } \omega \in O_h \text{ and } 0 \neq |k| \leq K, \quad (11.214)$$

where  $|k| = \sum_{j=1}^n |k_j|$ . Then the  $\mathcal{L}_\omega$  is an automorphism on the space of trigonometric polynomials in  $\theta \in \mathbb{T}^n$  of degree  $\leq K$  with zero order terms equal to 0 and we denote by  $\mathcal{L}_\omega^{-1}$  the inverse map. The Fourier coefficients of  $F := \mathcal{L}_\omega^{-1}(R - \hat{N})$  are  $F_k = (i\langle \omega, k \rangle)^{-1} R_k$  for  $0 < |k| \leq K$  and  $F_k = 0$  for  $k = 0$  and  $|k| > K$ . Hence,  $F$  is well defined, it solves (11.213) and it is affine linear in  $I$ . Now (11.212) reads

$$(N + R) \circ \Phi = N + \hat{N} + \int_0^1 \{(1-x)\hat{N} + xR, F\} \circ \exp(xX_F) dx. \quad (11.215)$$

Moreover, (11.208), (11.209) and (11.214) imply

$$|\partial_t^p F|_{s-2\sigma, r} \leq C_0 \frac{|\partial_t^p R|_{s-\sigma, r}}{\kappa \sigma^\tau} < C_0 \frac{\varepsilon}{\kappa \sigma^\tau}. \quad (11.216)$$

Using the Cauchy estimates one gets

$$|\partial_t^p (\sigma \partial_\theta)^\alpha (r \partial_I)^\beta F| \leq C_{\alpha, \beta} \frac{\varepsilon}{\kappa \sigma^\tau} \quad (11.217)$$

uniformly in  $D_{s-3\sigma, r/2} \times O_h \times [0, a]$  and for any  $0 \leq p \leq 1$  and  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^n$ ,  $|\beta| \leq 1$ . By (11.208), (11.209) and Cauchy one has as well

$$|\partial_t^p \hat{N}|_r = |\partial_t^p R_0|_r \leq |\partial_t^p R|_{s-\sigma, r} \leq C_0 \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad |\partial_t^p (r \partial_I) \hat{N}|_{r/2} \leq C_0 \varepsilon \quad (11.218)$$

for  $0 \leq p \leq 1$  uniformly with respect to  $t \in [0, a]$ . The derivatives of  $F$  and  $\hat{N}$  with respect  $I$  of order bigger than one are all zeros since the functions are affine linear in  $I$ .

*Step 3. Canonical transformation.* The solutions of the Cauchy problem (11.211) are real analytic in  $(x, \theta, I, \omega)$  and  $C^1$  in  $t$ . Consider the canonical transformation  $\Phi = (U, V)$ . Since  $F$  is affine linear in  $v$  one observes that  $u$  is independent of  $I$  and  $v$  is affine linear in  $I$ . In particular,  $U$  is independent of  $I$  and  $V$  is affine linear as a function of  $I$ . Moreover, (11.217) and condition (a) imply

$$|\partial_t^p \nabla_\theta F| \leq \eta r \leq r/8 \quad \text{and} \quad |\partial_t^p \nabla_I F| \leq \sigma \quad (11.219)$$

for  $0 \leq p \leq 1$  in  $D_{s-3\sigma, r/2} \times O_h \times [0, a]$  choosing the constant  $c_0 = c_0(n, \tau) < 1$  in (a) sufficiently small. Then

$$\exp(x X_H) : D_{s-4\sigma, r/4} \rightarrow D_{s-3\sigma, r/2} \quad (11.220)$$

for every  $(\omega, t) \in O_h \times [0, a]$  and  $0 \leq x \leq 1$ . In particular,  $\Phi(\cdot; \omega, t) = (U(\cdot; \omega, t), V(\cdot; \omega, t))$  is a well defined real analytic map

$$\Phi(\cdot; \omega, t) : D_{s-4\sigma, r/4} \rightarrow D_{s-3\sigma, r/2}$$

for every  $(\omega, t) \in O_h \times [0, a]$  and we get  $\Phi \in C^1([0, a], \mathcal{A}(D_{s-4\sigma, r/4} \times O_h, D_{s-3\sigma, r/2}))$ . We are going to show that

$$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sigma} |\partial_t^p (u(x, \theta, I; \omega, t) - \theta)| \leq C_0 \frac{\varepsilon}{\kappa r \sigma^{\tau+1}} \\ \frac{1}{r} |\partial_t^p (v(x, \theta, I; \omega, t) - I)| \leq C_0 \frac{\varepsilon}{\kappa r \sigma^{\tau+1}} \end{cases} \quad (11.221)$$

in  $[0, 1] \times D_{s-4\sigma, r/4} \times O_h \times [0, a]$ . For  $p = 0$  it follows directly from (11.211) and (11.217). Let  $p = 1$ . Set

$$\bar{u}(\theta, I; \omega, t) := \frac{1}{\sigma} \sup_{0 \leq x \leq 1} |\partial_t u(x, \theta, I; \omega, t)| \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{v}(\theta, I; \omega, t) := \frac{1}{r} \sup_{0 \leq x \leq 1} |\partial_t v(x, \theta, I; \omega, t)|.$$

Differentiating (11.211) with respect to  $t$  and using (11.217) one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u} &\leq \frac{1}{\sigma r} \sup_{0 \leq x \leq 1} |\partial_t (r \nabla_I) F| + \frac{1}{\sigma r} \sup_{0 \leq x \leq 1} |(\sigma \partial_\theta)(r \nabla_I) F| \bar{u} + \frac{1}{\sigma r} \sup_{0 \leq x \leq 1} |(r \partial_I)(r \nabla_I) F| \bar{v} \\ &\leq C \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{\kappa r \sigma^{\tau+1}} + \frac{\varepsilon}{\kappa r \sigma^{\tau+1}} \bar{u} + \frac{\varepsilon}{\kappa r \sigma^{\tau+1}} \bar{v} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where  $C = C(n, \tau) > 0$  and by (a) one obtains

$$\bar{u} \leq C \frac{\varepsilon}{\kappa r \sigma^{\tau+1}} + C c_0 (\bar{u} + \bar{v})$$

in  $D_{s-4\sigma, r/4} \times O_h \times [0, a]$ . Choosing  $c_0 \leq (4C)^{-1}$  this gives

$$\bar{u} \leq C \frac{\varepsilon}{\kappa r \sigma^{\tau+1}} + \frac{1}{4}(\bar{u} + \bar{v}).$$

The same estimate holds for  $\bar{v}$  and we get (11.221). By Cauchy this implies

$$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sigma} |\partial_t^p (\sigma \partial_\theta)^\alpha (r \partial_I)^\beta (u(x, \theta, I; \omega, t) - \theta)| \leq C_{\alpha, \beta} \frac{\varepsilon}{\kappa r \sigma^{\tau+1}} \\ \frac{1}{r} |\partial_t^p (\sigma \partial_\theta)^\alpha (r \partial_I)^\beta (v(x, \theta, I; \omega, t) - I)| \leq C_{\alpha, \beta} \frac{\varepsilon}{\kappa r \sigma^{\tau+1}} \end{cases} \quad (11.222)$$

in  $[0, 1] \times D_{s-5\sigma, r/8} \times O_h \times [0, a]$ . Since  $\eta < 1/8$  this proves the estimates of  $\Phi$  in (2). By (11.219)

$$\begin{aligned} |U(\theta, I; \omega, t) - I| &\leq \sup_{0 \leq x \leq 1} |\nabla_I F(\cdot; \omega, t)|_{s-3\sigma, r/2} \leq \sigma, \\ |V(\theta, I; \omega, t) - I| &\leq \sup_{0 \leq x \leq 1} |\nabla_\theta F(\cdot; \omega, t)|_{s-3\sigma, r/2} \leq \eta r \end{aligned}$$

on  $D_{s-5\sigma, \eta r} \times O_h \times [0, a]$  which implies that  $\Phi(\cdot; \omega, t)$  maps  $D_{s-5\sigma, \eta r}$  to  $D_{s-4\sigma, 2\eta r}$ , and that

$$\Phi \in C^1([0, a], \mathcal{A}(D_{s-5\sigma, \eta r} \times O_h, D_{s-4\sigma, 2\eta r})). \quad (11.223)$$

*Step 4. New error term.* The identity (11.215) yields

$$H \circ \Phi = (N + R) \circ \Phi + (P - R) \circ \Phi = N_+ + P_+ \quad (11.224)$$

where the Hamiltonian  $N_+ = N + \hat{N}$  is independent of  $\theta$  and affine linear in  $I$  and

$$P_+ = \int_0^1 \{(1-x)\hat{N} + xR, F\} \circ \exp(xX_F) dx + (P - R) \circ \Phi \quad (11.225)$$

is the new error term.

We are going to prove (11.206). In the case  $p = 0$  it follows from the corresponding estimates in [47]. Take  $p = 1$  and consider firstly

$$\partial_t((P - R) \circ \Phi) = (\partial_t(P - R)) \circ \Phi + (D(P - R) \circ \Phi) \partial_t \Phi,$$

where  $D$  stands for the differential with respect to  $(\theta, I)$ . By (11.223) and (11.210) we have

$$|\partial_t^p (P - R) \circ \Phi|_{s-5\sigma, \eta r} \leq |\partial_t^p (P - R)|_{s-4\sigma, 2\eta r} \leq C_0(\eta^2 + \sigma^{-n} e^{-K\sigma}) \varepsilon.$$

Moreover, (11.210) implies

$$|D(P - R)W^{-1}|_{s-4\sigma, 2\eta r} \leq C_0(\eta^2 + \sigma^{-n} e^{-K\sigma}),$$

while (11.222) gives  $|W\partial_t\Phi| \leq C_0\varepsilon/\kappa r\sigma^{\tau+1}$  on  $D_{s-5\sigma,r/8}$ , and we get

$$\begin{aligned} |(D(P-R)\circ\Phi)\partial_t\Phi|_{s-5\sigma,\eta r} &\leq |D(P-R)W^{-1}|_{s-4\sigma,r/2}|W\partial_t\Phi|_{s-5\sigma,r/8} \\ &\leq C_0(\eta^2\varepsilon + \sigma^{-n}e^{-K\sigma}\varepsilon)\frac{\varepsilon}{\kappa r\sigma^{\tau+1}} \end{aligned}$$

uniformly with respect to  $(\omega, t) \in O_h \times [0, a]$ . To evaluate the first term, we consider

$$G := \partial_t(\{R, F\} \circ \exp(xX_F)) = G_1 + G_2 + G_3,$$

where

$$G_1 := \{\partial_t R, F\} \circ \exp(xX_F), \quad G_2 := \{R, \partial_t F\} \circ \exp(xX_F)$$

and

$$G_3 := D\{R, F\} \circ \exp(xX_F) \cdot \partial_t \exp(xX_F).$$

Using (11.220) one obtains

$$|\{\partial_t^p R, \partial_t^q F\} \circ \exp(xX_F)|_{s-5\sigma,\eta r} \leq |\{\partial_t^p R, \partial_t^q F\}|_{s-3\sigma,r/2}$$

for  $0 \leq p, q \leq 1$ . Now (11.210) and (11.217) imply

$$\begin{aligned} |\{\partial_t^p R, \partial_t^q F\}|_{s-3\sigma,r/2} &\leq |\partial_t^p \nabla_I R| |\partial_t^q \nabla_\theta F| + |\partial_t^p \nabla_I F| |\partial_t^q \nabla_\theta R| \\ &\leq C_0 \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{r} \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{\kappa \sigma^{\tau+1}} + \frac{\varepsilon}{\kappa r \sigma^\tau} \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{\sigma} \right) = 2C_0 \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\kappa r \sigma^{\tau+1}} \end{aligned}$$

uniformly with respect to  $(\omega, t) \in O_h \times [0, a]$ , which gives the desired estimate for  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ . By the same argument one obtains

$$|(\sigma\partial_\theta)^\alpha (r\partial_I)^\beta \{R, F\}|_{s-3\sigma,r/2} \leq C_{\alpha,\beta} \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{r} \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{\kappa \sigma^{\tau+1}} + \frac{\varepsilon}{\kappa r \sigma^\tau} \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{\sigma} \right) = 2C_{\alpha,\beta} \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\kappa r \sigma^{\tau+1}}.$$

Using (11.222) and the preceding estimate one gets

$$\begin{aligned} |G_3|_{s-5\sigma,\eta r} &\leq |(\sigma D_\theta)\{R, F\}|_{s-3\sigma,r/2} |\sigma^{-1} \partial_t u|_{s-5\sigma,\eta r} \\ &\quad + |(r D_I)\{R, F\}|_{s-3\sigma,r/2} |r^{-1} \partial_t u|_{s-5\sigma,\eta r} \leq C_0 \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\kappa r \sigma^{\tau+1}} \end{aligned}$$

where  $D_\theta$  and  $D_I$  are the partial differentials with respect to  $\theta$  and  $I$  respectively. The function  $\partial_t(\{\hat{N}, F\} \circ \exp(xX_F))$  can be evaluated in the same way using (11.218). This proves (11.206).

*Step 5. Transforming the frequencies.* Consider

$$N(I; \omega, t) + \hat{N}(I; \omega, t) = e_+(\omega, t) + \langle \omega + (\nabla_I \hat{N})(\omega, t), I \rangle = e_+(\omega, t) + \langle \omega + (\nabla_I R_0)(\omega, t), I \rangle.$$

Following Pöschel [47], Sec. 4, we obtain a real analytic inverse  $\phi : O_{h/4} \rightarrow O_{h/2}$  of the map

$$\omega \rightarrow \omega_+ := \omega + (\nabla_I R_0)(\omega, t)$$

i.e.  $\phi(\omega_+) + (\nabla_I R_0)(\phi(\omega_+), t) = \omega_+$  for  $\omega_+ \in O_{h/4}$ . We set  $N_+ = (N + \hat{N}) \circ \phi$ . Using Cauchy's estimate and (b) we get as in [47] the estimates

$$|\partial_t^p (h \partial_\omega)^\gamma (\phi(\omega, t) - \omega)| \leq C_\gamma \frac{\varepsilon}{r}$$

uniformly in  $O_{h/4} \times [0, a]$ . □

**Remark 11.4** *The transformation  $\mathcal{F} = (U, V)$  is uniquely defined by the condition*

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^n} (U(\theta; \omega, t) - \theta) d\theta = 0. \quad (11.226)$$

To satisfy (11.226) we take the zero order term of the Fourier expansion of  $F$  with respect to  $\theta$  to be zero, i.e.  $F_0 = 0$ , which gives a unique solution of the homological equation (11.213). In particular,  $\mathcal{F}$  does not depend on the choice of the parameters  $s, \sigma, \eta, r, K$ , and  $h$ , provided that (11.226) holds.

### 11.1.2 Preparing the next iteration.

We are going to prepare the next iteration. Choose a “weighted error”  $E$  satisfying

$$0 < E \leq \eta^2 < 1/64 \quad (11.227)$$

fix  $0 < \hat{\varepsilon} \leq 1$  and set

$$\varepsilon = \hat{\varepsilon} \kappa r \sigma^{\tau+1} E. \quad (11.228)$$

Given  $0 < \sigma < 1$  and  $\eta \geq E^{1/2}$  define  $K$  and  $h$  by

$$\sigma^{-n} e^{-K\sigma} = \eta^2, \quad h = \frac{\kappa}{2K^{\tau+1}}. \quad (11.229)$$

This implies

$$K = \sigma^{-1} x \quad \text{where} \quad x = K\sigma = n \ln(1/\sigma) + 2 \ln(1/\eta) > 1 \quad (11.230)$$

since  $0 < \sigma < 1/5$ .

**Lemma 11.5** *There exist  $0 < \sigma^0(n, \tau) < 1/5$  and  $A(n, \tau) > 0$  such that the conditions a)-d) of Proposition 11.1 are satisfied for given  $0 < \sigma < \sigma^0(n, \tau)$  and  $0 < E < E^0(n, \tau)$  provided that*

$$(-\ln \sigma)^{\tau+1} E \leq A(n, \tau). \quad (11.231)$$

*Proof.* Firstly, a) follows from the definition of  $\epsilon$  choosing  $E < c_0$  and c) follows from the definition  $h$ , while (d) follows from the inequality  $K\sigma = x > 1$ . Condition b) amounts to

$$2x^{\tau+1} E \leq c_0 \quad (11.232)$$

in view of (11.228) and (11.229). Using (11.230) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 2x^{\tau+1} E &< C_1(n, \tau) \left( (-\ln \eta)^{\tau+1} E + (-\ln \sigma)^{\tau+1} E \right) \\ &< C_1(n, \tau) \left( (-\ln \eta)^{\tau+1} \eta E^{1/2} + (-\ln \sigma)^{\tau+1} E \right) \leq C_2(n, \tau) \left( E^{1/2} + (-\ln \sigma)^{\tau+1} E \right). \end{aligned}$$

Set  $A(n, \tau) := c_0^2(2C_2)^{-2}$  and recall that  $0 < c_0 < 1$ ,  $C_2 > 1$  and  $-\ln \sigma > \ln 5 > 1$ . Then (11.231) implies (11.232) which yields b) in Proposition 11.1.  $\square$

We are going to fix  $\eta$  and to determine the parameters  $\epsilon_+$ ,  $s_+$ ,  $\sigma_+$ ,  $r_+$ ,  $x_+$ ,  $K_+$ ,  $h_+$ , and the weighted error  $E_+$  for the next iteration. Let

$$0 \leq \hat{\epsilon} \leq \hat{\epsilon}^+ \leq 1. \quad (11.233)$$

Since  $E < \eta^2$  and  $K\sigma > 1$  the smallness condition in (11.206) can be written as follows

$$|\partial_t^p P_+|_{s-5\sigma, \eta r, h/4} \leq C_0 \hat{\epsilon} \kappa r \sigma^{\tau+1} E (E + (\eta^2 + \sigma^{-n} e^{-K\sigma})) < 3C_0 \hat{\epsilon}^+ \eta^2 \kappa r \sigma^{\tau+1} E := \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_+, \quad (11.234)$$

where  $0 \leq p \leq k \leq 1$  and  $C_0 = C_0(n, \tau) \geq 1$  depends only on  $n$  and  $\tau$ . Set

$$r_+ = \eta r, \quad s_+ = s - 5\sigma, \quad \sigma_+ = \delta \sigma, \quad (11.235)$$

where  $0 < \delta < 1$  will be fixed below and put  $\epsilon_+ := \hat{\epsilon}^+ \kappa r_+ \sigma_+^{\tau+1} E_+$ . Plugging the expression of  $\epsilon_+$  in (11.234) and using (11.235) we get

$$E_+ = (6C_0(n, \tau) \delta^{-\tau-1}) \eta E$$

which leads to an exponentially converging iteration scheme if  $\eta < \delta^{\tau+1}/6C_0(n, \tau)$ . Now we set

$$\delta := (6C_0(n, \tau))^{-1/\vartheta}, \quad \eta := \delta^{\tau+1+\vartheta+\nu}, \quad \vartheta := \vartheta_0/3, \quad (11.236)$$

where  $\nu$  is a positive number which will be determined in Sect. 11.2 and  $0 < \vartheta_0 < 1$  is fixed in (10.202). In particular, (11.236) implies that

$$0 < \delta < 1/(6C_0) < 1/4 \quad \text{and} \quad \eta < \delta^2 < 1/8,$$

since  $C_0 > 1$  and  $\tau > n - 1 \geq 1$ . Moreover,

$$E_+ = \delta^\nu E. \quad (11.237)$$

Set  $\eta_+ = \eta \delta^{\nu_+-\nu}$  with certain  $\nu_+ \geq \nu$  which will be determined by the next iteration and put  $h_+ = (\kappa/2) K_+^{-\tau-1}$ , where  $K_+ = x_+/\sigma_+$  and

$$x_+ = n \ln(1/\sigma_+) + 2 \ln(1/\eta_+) = x + (n + \nu_+ - \nu) \ln(1/\delta) > x > 1. \quad (11.238)$$

Then

$$\frac{h_+}{h} = \left( \frac{x}{x_+} \right)^{\tau+1} \left( \frac{\sigma_+}{\sigma} \right)^{\tau+1} < \delta^{\tau+1} < \frac{1}{4}, \quad (11.239)$$

and (11.234) implies

$$|\partial_t^p P_+|_{s_+, r_+, h_+} \leq \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_+ = \frac{1}{2} \hat{\epsilon}^+ \kappa r_+ \sigma_+^{\tau+1} E_+ \quad (11.240)$$

for  $0 \leq p \leq k \leq 1$ . We have prepared the next iteration.

The Hamiltonian  $P_t$  is not analytic and one can not apply directly the KAM step to it. We are going to approximate it by real analytic functions. To this end we recall some facts about the analytic smoothing technique in Section A.1. We are going to apply the Approximation

Lemma A.1 and Remark A.2 to the real valued Hamiltonian  $P \in C^k([0, a]; C_0^L(\mathbb{A}^n \times \Omega))$ , where  $a > 0$ ,  $0 < L \leq \infty$  and the partial dilation is given by  $\sigma_{r,\kappa}(\theta, I; \omega) = (\theta, rI; \kappa\omega)$ . Set

$$u_j = u_0 \delta^j, \quad v_j = r u_j, \quad w_j = \kappa u_j, \quad j \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (11.241)$$

where  $0 < u_0 \leq 1$  and  $0 < \delta = \delta(n, \tau, \vartheta) < 1$  is given by (11.236), and denote by  $\mathcal{U}_j$  the complex strips in  $\mathbb{C}^n / \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n$  consisting of all  $(\theta, I; \omega)$  such that

$$|\operatorname{Im} \theta| \leq u_j, \quad |\operatorname{Im} I| \leq v_j, \quad |\operatorname{Im} \omega| \leq w_j. \quad (11.242)$$

and by  $A(\mathcal{U}_j)$  the set of all real-analytic bounded functions in  $\mathcal{U}_j$  equipped with the sup-norm  $|\cdot|_{u_j, v_j, w_j}$ . Let

$$P_t^j := S_{u_j, v_j, w_j} P_t, \quad j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

This a  $C^k$  family with respect to  $t \in [0, 1]$  of real analytic functions in  $\mathbb{C}^n / \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n$ . Moreover, (A.6) and Remark A.2 yield the estimate

$$\left| \partial_t^p (P_t^j - P_t^{j-1}) \right|_{u_j, v_j, w_j} \leq c u_j^\ell \|\partial_t^p P_t\|_{\ell; r, \kappa} \quad (11.243)$$

for each finite  $\ell$ ,  $0 \leq \ell \leq L$  and  $0 \leq p \leq k$ , where  $c = c(n, \ell, \delta)$  is a positive constant depending only on  $n, \ell$  and  $\delta$ , while (A.5) implies

$$\left| \partial_t^p P_t^0 \right|_{u_0, v_0, w_0} \leq \tilde{c} u_0^\ell \|\partial_t^p P_t\|_{\ell; r, \kappa} \quad (11.244)$$

where  $\tilde{c} = 2c(n, \ell, \delta) u_0^{-\ell}$ . The positive constant  $c_\ell := \max(c, \tilde{c})$  depends only on  $n, \ell, \delta$  and  $u_0$ .

## 11.2 Iteration

As in [47] we are going to iterate the KAM step infinitely many times choosing appropriately the parameters  $0 < s, r, \sigma, h, \eta < 1$  and so on. Our goal is to get a convergent scheme. We are going to define suitable strictly decreasing sequences of positive numbers  $\{s_j\}_{j=0}^\infty$ ,  $\{r_j\}_{j=0}^\infty$  and  $\{h_j\}_{j=0}^\infty$ , tending to 0, and denote

$$D_j := D_{s_j, r_j}, \quad O_j := O_{h_j}, \quad \mathcal{V}_j := D_j \times O_j. \quad (11.245)$$

Set

$$s_j = s_0 \delta^j, \quad \sigma_j = \sigma_0 \delta^j, \quad s_0 = 5\sigma_0(1 - \delta)^{-1} \in (0, 1), \quad (11.246)$$

where  $\delta$  is given by (11.236), while  $0 < \sigma_0 < (1 - \delta)/5$  will be determined later (see Lemma 11.6). Let  $\{\nu_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  be an increasing sequence of positive numbers such that

$$\vartheta = \vartheta_0/3 = \nu_0 \leq \nu_j \leq C(n, \tau)j, \quad j \geq 1. \quad (11.247)$$

Let  $0 < r_0 = r < 1$ . Taking into account (11.236) we set

$$\eta_j = \eta_j(\nu_j) := \delta^{\tau+1+\vartheta+\nu_j} \quad \text{and} \quad r_j = r_j(\nu_j) = r_0 \Pi_{k=0}^j \eta_k = r \delta^{j(\tau+1)} \delta^{\nu_0+\dots+\nu_j}, \quad (11.248)$$

Then (11.237) reads

$$E_j = \delta^{\nu_0+\dots+\nu_j} E_0 \quad (11.249)$$

and according to (11.228) we put

$$\varepsilon_j = \varepsilon_j(\nu_j) := \hat{\varepsilon}_j \kappa r_j \sigma_j^{\tau+1} E_j = \hat{\varepsilon}_j \kappa r \sigma_0^{\tau+1} E_0 \delta^{q_j}, \quad (11.250)$$

where

$$q_j := j(2\tau + 2 + \vartheta_0) + 2(\nu_0 + \dots + \nu_j)$$

and  $0 < \hat{\varepsilon}_j \leq 1$  is to be chosen later. Finally, taking into account (11.229) we set

$$h_j = \frac{\kappa}{2K_j^{\tau+1}} \quad \text{and} \quad K_j = x_j \sigma_j^{-1}, \quad j \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (11.251)$$

where  $x_j, j \in \mathbb{N}_*$ , is given by

$$x_j = n \ln(1/\sigma_j) + 2 \ln(1/\eta_j) = x_{j-1} + (n + \nu_j - \nu_{j-1}) \ln(1/\delta) > x_{j-1} > \dots > x_0 > 2n. \quad (11.252)$$

Then we have

$$s_{j+1} = s_j - 5\sigma_j, \quad \sigma_j = 5^{-1}(1 - \delta)s_j \quad \text{and} \quad h_{j+1}/h_j < \delta^{\tau+1} < 1/4 \quad (11.253)$$

in view of (11.239) and (11.246).

To satisfy at any step of the iteration the conditions a) - d) of Proposition 11.1 and Remark 11.2 we need the following Lemma.

**Lemma 11.6** *Let  $\{\nu_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  be an increasing sequence satisfying (11.247). Then there are positive constants  $0 < \tilde{\sigma}_0(n, \tau, \vartheta_0) < (1 - \delta)/5$  and  $\tilde{E}_0(n, \tau, \vartheta_0) < 1/64$  depending only on  $n, \tau$  and  $\vartheta_0$  such that  $E_j < \eta_j^2$  and the hypothesis (a)-(d) hold for any  $j \geq 0$  provided that  $0 < \sigma_0 \leq \tilde{\sigma}_0$  and  $0 < E_0 \leq \tilde{E}_0$ .*

*Proof.* Choosing  $E_0 < \delta^{2\tau+2+\vartheta_0}$  and using (11.247), (11.248) and (11.249) we get  $E_j < \eta_j^2$  for  $j \geq 0$ . Choosing  $E_0 \leq c_0$  we get (a) for any  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , while (11.251) implies (c). On the other hand, (b) holds if  $E_j$  and  $\sigma_j$  verify (11.231). Since  $0 < \delta < 1$  and  $\vartheta_0/3 = \nu_0 \leq \nu_1 \leq \dots$ , using the estimate  $x^m \exp(-x) \leq C(m)$  for  $x \geq 0$  we get from (11.246) and (11.249) the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} E_j(-\ln \sigma_j)^{\tau+1} &< E_0 \exp(-j\nu_0 \ln(1/\delta)) (\ln(1/\sigma_0) + j \ln(1/\delta))^{\tau+1} \\ &< E_0 2^{\tau+1} \exp(-j\nu_0 \ln(1/\delta)) (\ln^{\tau+1}(1/\sigma_0) + (j \ln(1/\delta))^{\tau+1}) \\ &\leq C_0(n, \tau) ((1/\vartheta_0)^{\tau+1} + (\ln(1/\sigma_0))^{\tau+1}) E_0 \leq A(n, \tau) \end{aligned}$$

choosing  $E_0 \leq \tilde{E}_0(n, \tau, \vartheta_0)$  sufficiently small, and we get b) for any  $j \geq 0$  in view of (11.231). Finally, (d) holds since  $x_j = K_j \sigma_j > 2n > 1$ .  $\square$

Using (11.247), (11.249)-(11.252) and choosing  $E_0 = E_0(n, \tau, \vartheta_0) \leq \tilde{E}_0(n, \tau, \vartheta_0)$  sufficiently small we estimate

$$\frac{\varepsilon_j}{r_j h_j} \leq 2x_j^{\tau+1} E_j \leq 2x_j^{\tau+1} \delta^{j\vartheta} E_0 = 2x_j^{\tau+1} \sigma_j^{\vartheta} \sigma_0^{-\vartheta} E_0 < x_j^{\tau+1} \sigma_j^{\vartheta} E_0^{1/2} < \sigma_j^{\vartheta/2} < 1/2. \quad (11.254)$$

From now on we fix  $\sigma_0 = \tilde{\sigma}_0(n, \tau, \vartheta_0)$  and  $0 < E_0(n, \tau, \vartheta_0) \leq \tilde{E}_0$ . Then  $\sigma_0, E_0$ , and  $s_0 = 5(1 - \delta)^{-1} \sigma_0$  depend only on  $n, \tau$  and  $\vartheta_0$ .

Let  $P \in C^k([0, a], C_0^L(\mathbb{A}^n \times \Omega))$ , where  $0 \leq k \leq 1$ ,  $\ell_0 = 2\tau + 2 + \vartheta_0 \leq L \leq +\infty$  and  $0 < \vartheta_0 \leq 1$ . Choosing  $(u_0, v_0, w_0)$  in (11.241) by  $u_0 = 4s_0$ ,  $v_0 = 4rs_0$  and  $w_0 = 4\kappa s_0$  and applying the Approximation Lemma we obtain a sequence

$$P^j \in C^k([0, a], \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{C}^n/\mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n)), \quad j \in \mathbb{N},$$

such that  $P_t^j = P^j(\cdot, t)$  is real analytic and satisfies (11.243) and (11.244). More precisely,

$$|\partial_t^p P_t^0|_{u_0, v_0, w_0} \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}_{\ell, 0} \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \partial_t^p P_t^j - \partial_t^p P_t^{j-1} \right|_{u_j, v_j, w_j} \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}_{\ell, j} \quad \text{for } j \geq 1 \quad (11.255)$$

for any finite  $\ell$ ,  $0 \leq \ell \leq L \leq \infty$ , where

$$\tilde{\varepsilon}_{\ell, j} := c_\ell u_j^\ell \sum_{p=0}^k \sup_{0 \leq t \leq a} \|\partial_t^p P_t\|_{\ell; r, \kappa} \quad (11.256)$$

and  $c_\ell = c(\ell, n, \tau, \vartheta_0) > 0$  depends only on  $\ell$ ,  $n$ ,  $\tau$  and  $\vartheta_0$  (recall that  $u_0 = 4s_0$  and that  $\delta$  and  $s_0$  depend only on  $n$ ,  $\tau$  and  $\vartheta_0$ ).

We would like to deal with  $P^j$  at the  $j$ -th iteration putting  $P^j - P^{j-1}$  in the error term. To this end we need the following inequalities

$$|\partial_t^p P_t^0|_{u_0, v_0, w_0} \leq \frac{\varepsilon_1}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \partial_t^p P_t^j - \partial_t^p P_t^{j-1} \right|_{u_j, v_j, w_j} \leq \frac{\varepsilon_{j+1}}{2} \quad \text{for } j \geq 1 \quad (11.257)$$

which follow from

$$\forall j \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \tilde{\varepsilon}_{\ell, j} \leq \frac{\varepsilon_{j+1}}{2} = \frac{1}{2} \hat{\varepsilon}_j \kappa r_{j+1} \sigma_{j+1}^{\tau+1} E_{j+1}. \quad (11.258)$$

Here  $r_j = r_j(\nu_j)$  and  $E_j = E_j(\nu_j)$  are given by (11.248) and (11.249), respectively, and  $\hat{\varepsilon}_j \in (0, 1]$  will be chosen later. In view of (11.241), (11.248) and (11.249), the relation (11.258) reads

$$\sum_{p=0}^k \sup_{0 \leq t \leq a} \|\partial_t^p P_t\|_{\ell; r, \kappa} \leq \hat{\varepsilon}_j \kappa r \sigma_0^{\tau+1} E_0 \frac{(\delta/4s_0)^\ell}{2c_\ell} \delta^{(j+1)M(\nu_j, \ell)}, \quad (11.259)$$

where

$$M(\nu, \ell) := 2\tau + 2 + \vartheta + 2\nu - \ell. \quad (11.260)$$

To satisfy the inequality (11.259) for given  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  and any  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  we choose appropriately  $\nu_j$  in a function of  $\ell$ . There are two cases.

*Case 1.* This case will be used to prove (i), Theorem 10.1. Let  $\ell = \ell_0 = 2\tau + 2 + \vartheta_0$ , where  $0 < \vartheta_0 < 1$ . Choosing

$$\nu_j = \vartheta := \vartheta_0/3 = (\ell_0 - 2\tau - 2 - \vartheta)/2, \quad j \in \mathbb{N},$$

we obtain  $M(\nu_j, \ell_0) = 0$ . Set  $\hat{\varepsilon}_j = \hat{\varepsilon}_0$  for  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then (11.259) follows from

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq a} \|\partial_t^p P_t\|_{\ell_0; r, \kappa} \leq \frac{1}{2} \hat{\varepsilon}_0 \kappa r \sigma_0^{\tau+1} E_0 \frac{(\delta/4s_0)^{\ell_0}}{2c_{\ell_0}} \quad (11.261)$$

for  $p = 0, 1$ . To satisfy (11.261) for  $p = 0$  we fix the small constant  $\varepsilon$  in (10.203) and  $\hat{\varepsilon}_0$  by

$$\varepsilon := \frac{1}{2} \sigma_0^{\tau+1} E_0 \frac{(\delta/4s_0)^{\ell_0}}{2c_{\ell_0}} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\varepsilon}_0 := (\kappa r \varepsilon)^{-1} \|P_t\|_{\ell_0; r, \kappa} \in (0, 1]. \quad (11.262)$$

Notice that  $\varepsilon$  depends only on  $n, \tau$  and  $\vartheta_0$  since  $c_{\ell_0}, \delta, \sigma_0, s_0$  and  $E_0$  depend only on  $n, \tau$  and  $\vartheta$  by (11.236), (11.253) and Lemma 11.6. In the case when  $p = k = 1$  the condition (11.261) becomes

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq a} \|\partial_t P_t\|_{\ell_0; r, \kappa} \leq \hat{\varepsilon}_0 \varepsilon.$$

To satisfy it we rescale  $t$  by setting  $\tilde{t} = tT \in [0, \tilde{a}]$ , where  $\tilde{a} = aT$  and

$$T = (\hat{\varepsilon}_0 \varepsilon)^{-1} \sum_{p=0}^1 \sup_{0 \leq t \leq a} \|\partial_t^p P_t\|_{\ell_0; r, \kappa}.$$

Now the derivative of  $\tilde{P}_{\tilde{t}} := P_{\tilde{t}/T}$  with respect to  $\tilde{t}$  satisfies (11.261). At each iteration we will apply Proposition 11.1 to  $\tilde{P}_{\tilde{t}}^j$  for  $t \in [0, \tilde{a}]$ . Recall that the different constants in Proposition 11.1 do not depend on  $a$ , hence, without loss of generality, writing  $P_t$  instead of  $\tilde{P}_{\tilde{t}}$  and  $a$  instead of  $\tilde{a}$  we obtain that (11.261) holds for  $p = 0, 1$  with  $\varepsilon$  and  $\hat{\varepsilon}_0$  given by (11.262).

*Case 2.* This case will be used to prove (ii), Theorem 10.1. We allow  $\ell$  to depend on  $j$ . Fix  $m \geq 1$ . Given an integer  $j(m) \geq 0$  which will be fixed below, we set

$$\ell_j = \begin{cases} \ell_0 & \text{for } j < j(m), \\ 2m(\tau + 1) + \ell_0 & \text{for } j \geq j(m) \end{cases} \quad (11.263)$$

and

$$\nu_j = \begin{cases} \vartheta = \vartheta_0/3 & \text{for } j < j(m), \\ m(\tau + 1) + \vartheta/2 & \text{for } j \geq j(m) \end{cases} \quad (11.264)$$

and choose  $\varepsilon_j = \varepsilon_j(\nu_j)$  as in (11.250). We still have (11.259) for  $j < j(m)$  since  $\ell_j = \ell_0$  and  $\nu_j = \vartheta$  for  $j < j(m)$ . For  $j \geq j(m)$  we have  $\ell_j = \ell(m) = 2m(\tau + 1) + \ell_0 = 2(m + 1)(\tau + 1) + 3\vartheta$  and we get from (11.260) the equality

$$M(\nu_j, \ell_j) = -\vartheta.$$

Now (11.259) becomes

$$A_j := \delta^{(j+1)\vartheta} c_{\ell(m)} \left( \frac{4s_0}{\delta} \right)^{\ell(m)} \sigma_0^{-\tau-1} E_0^{-1} \frac{1}{\kappa r} \sum_{p=0}^k \sup_{0 \leq t \leq a} \|\partial_t^p P_t\|_{\ell(m); r, \kappa} \leq 1. \quad (11.265)$$

The sequence  $A_j$  is decreasing and it tends to zero. Let  $j(m)$  be the smallest integer  $j \geq m$  such that  $A_{j(m)} \leq 1$  and set

$$\hat{\varepsilon}_j = \begin{cases} \hat{\varepsilon}_0 & \text{for } j < j(m), \\ \max\{A_{j(m)}, \hat{\varepsilon}_0\} & \text{for } j \geq j(m). \end{cases} \quad (11.266)$$

Then the increasing sequence  $\{\nu_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  satisfies (11.247),  $0 < \hat{\varepsilon}_j \leq \hat{\varepsilon}_{j+1} \leq 1$ , and (11.233) and (11.258) hold for any  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Moreover,

$$\forall j \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \hat{\varepsilon}_j \leq \frac{C}{\kappa^r} \sum_{p=0}^k \sup_{0 \leq t \leq a} \|\partial_t^p P_t\|_{\ell(m); r, \kappa} \quad (11.267)$$

with

$$C = C(m, n, \tau, \vartheta_0) = \max \left\{ c_{\ell(m)} \left( \frac{4s_0}{\delta} \right)^{\ell(m)} \sigma_0^{-\tau-1} E_0^{-1}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right\}$$

depending only on  $m, n, \tau$  and  $\vartheta_0$ . We summarize the above construction by the following

**Lemma 11.7** *Fix  $\varepsilon$  and  $\hat{\varepsilon}_0$  by (11.262). Then the following holds.*

1. *Choose  $\ell_j = \ell_0$ ,  $\nu_j = \vartheta = \vartheta_0/3$  and  $\hat{\varepsilon}_j = \hat{\varepsilon}_0$  in (11.247) - (11.250). Then the sequence  $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{\ell_j, j}$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , satisfies (11.258).*
2. *Fix an integer  $m \geq 1$  and choose  $\ell_j, \nu_j$  and  $\hat{\varepsilon}_j$  by (11.264)-(11.266). Then the sequence  $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{\ell_j, j}$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , satisfies (11.258) and (11.267) holds.*

We are ready to make the iterations. Consider the real-analytic in  $\mathcal{U}_j$  Hamiltonian

$$H_t^j(\varphi, I; \omega) = H^j(\varphi, I; \omega, t) := N_0(I; \omega) + P_t^j(\varphi, I; \omega),$$

where  $N_0(I; \omega) := \langle \omega, I \rangle$ . Set  $\tilde{D}_j := D_{s_j/2, r_j/2}$  and  $\tilde{O}_j := O_{h_j/2}$ . We have

$$D_{j+1} \times O_{j+1} \subset \tilde{D}_j \times \tilde{O}_j \subset D_j \times O_j$$

since  $s_{j+1}/s_j, r_{j+1}/r_j, h_{j+1}/h_j \leq \delta < 1/2$ . For any  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , we denote by  $\mathcal{D}_j$  the class of real-analytic diffeomorphisms

$$\mathcal{F}_j : D_{j+1} \times O_{j+1} \rightarrow \tilde{D}_j \times \tilde{O}_j$$

of the form

$$\mathcal{F}_j(\theta, I; \omega) = (\Phi_j(\theta, I; \omega), \phi_j(\omega)), \quad \Phi_j(\theta, I; \omega) = (U_j(\theta; \omega), V_j(\theta, I; \omega)), \quad (11.268)$$

where  $V_j(\theta, I; \omega)$  is affine linear with respect to  $I$ , and  $(\theta, I) \rightarrow \Phi_j(\theta, I; \omega)$  is a canonical transformation for any fixed  $\omega$ . To simplify the notations we denote the sup-norm in  $D_j \times O_j$  by  $|\cdot|_j$  instead of  $|\cdot|_{s_j, r_j, h_j}$ . Obviously,  $D_j \times O_j \subset \mathcal{U}_j$ .

**Proposition 11.8 (Iterative Lemma).** *Let  $P^j \in C^k([0, a], \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{U}_j))$ ,  $j \geq 0$ , be a  $C^k$ ,  $k = 0, 1$ , family of real-analytic Hamiltonians on  $\mathcal{U}_j$  satisfying (11.257). Then for each  $j \geq 0$  there is a normal form  $N_j(I; \omega, t) = e_j(\omega, t) + \langle \omega, I \rangle$  and  $C^k$  family of real analytic transformations*

$$\mathcal{F}^j \in C^k([0, a], \mathcal{A}(D_j \times O_j, (D_0 \times O_0) \cap \mathcal{U}_j))$$

such that

1.  $\mathcal{F}^0 = id$  and  $\mathcal{F}^{j+1} = \mathcal{F}_0 \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{F}_j$  where

$$\mathcal{F}_j \in C^k([0, a], \mathcal{A}(D_{j+1} \times O_{j+1}, \tilde{D}_j \times \tilde{O}_j)) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{F}_j(\cdot, t) \in \mathcal{D}_j, \quad j \geq 0, \quad (11.269)$$

2.  $H^j \circ \mathcal{F}^{j+1} = N_{j+1} + R_{j+1}$  and  $|R_{j+1}|_{j+1} \leq \varepsilon_{j+1}$ ,

3. Moreover,

$$|\overline{W}_j \partial_t^p (\mathcal{F}_j(\cdot, t) - \text{id})|_{j+1}, |\overline{W}_j \partial_t^p (D\mathcal{F}_j(\cdot, t) - \text{Id}) \overline{W}_j^{-1}|_{j+1} < \frac{C_0 \varepsilon_j}{r_j h_j}, \quad (11.270)$$

$$|\overline{W}_0 \partial_t^p (\mathcal{F}^{j+1}(\cdot, t) - \mathcal{F}^j(\cdot, t))|_{j+1} < \frac{C_0 \varepsilon_j}{r_j h_j}, \quad (11.271)$$

for  $0 \leq p \leq k$  and uniformly with respect to  $t \in [0, a]$ , where  $C_0 = C_0(n, \tau, \vartheta_0) > 0$ ,  $D\mathcal{F}^j(\cdot, t)$  stands for the Jacobian of  $\mathcal{F}^j(\cdot, t)$  with respect to  $(\theta, I; \omega)$ , and  $\overline{W}_j = \text{diag}(\sigma_j^{-1} \text{Id}, r_j^{-1} \text{Id}, h_j^{-1} \text{Id})$ .

*Proof.* The proof is similar to that of the Iterative Lemma in [47] and it is done in [52] in the case of Gevrey Hamiltonians independent of  $t$ . Additional efforts are required for the proof of the estimates (11.270) and (11.271) in the case when  $p = 1$ .

Firstly, applying the KAM step to the Hamiltonian  $H^0$  we find  $\mathcal{F}^1 = \mathcal{F}_0$  such that  $H^0 \circ \mathcal{F}^1 = N_1 + R_1$ , where  $R_1(\cdot, t)$  is real analytic in  $D_1 \times O_1$  and  $|R_1(\cdot, t)|_1 \leq \varepsilon_1$ . By recurrence we define for any  $j \geq 1$  the transformation  $\mathcal{F}^{j+1} = \mathcal{F}^j \circ \mathcal{F}_j$ , where  $\mathcal{F}_j$  belongs to  $\mathcal{D}_j$ . By the inductive assumption we have

$$H^{j-1} \circ \mathcal{F}^j = N_j + R_j,$$

where  $N_j(I; \omega, t) = e_j(\omega, t) + \langle \omega, I \rangle$ ,  $R_j(\cdot, t)$  is real analytic in  $D_j \times O_j$ , and  $|R_j(\cdot, t)|_j \leq \varepsilon_j$ . Then we write

$$\begin{aligned} H^j \circ \mathcal{F}^{j+1} &= (N_0 + P^{j-1}) \circ \mathcal{F}^{j+1} + (P^j - P^{j-1}) \circ \mathcal{F}^{j+1} \\ &= [H^{j-1} \circ \mathcal{F}^j] \circ \mathcal{F}_j + (P^j - P^{j-1}) \circ \mathcal{F}^{j+1} \\ &= (N_j + R_j) \circ \mathcal{F}_j + (P^j - P^{j-1}) \circ \mathcal{F}^{j+1}. \end{aligned}$$

We apply the KAM step - Proposition 11.1 - to the  $C^k$  family of Hamiltonians  $N_j(\cdot, t) + R_j(\cdot, t)$ , where  $R_j(\cdot, t)$  is real-analytic in  $D_j \times O_j$ . Using Remark 11.3, (11.240) and (11.254) as well we find a  $C^k$  family of real-analytic maps

$$\mathcal{F}_j(\cdot, t) : D_{j+1} \times O_{j+1} \rightarrow \tilde{D}_j \times \tilde{O}_j$$

which belong to the class  $\mathcal{D}_j$  and such that  $(N_j + R_j) \circ \mathcal{F}_j = N_{j+1} + R_{j+1,1}$ , where

$$|\partial_t^p R_{j+1,1}|_{j+1} \leq \frac{1}{2} \hat{\varepsilon}_j \kappa r_{j+1} \sigma_{j+1}^{\tau+1} E_{j+1} \leq \frac{1}{2} \hat{\varepsilon}_{j+1} \kappa r_{j+1} \sigma_{j+1}^{\tau+1} E_{j+1} = \frac{\varepsilon_{j+1}}{2}.$$

Moreover,  $\mathcal{F}_j$  satisfies (11.270) in view of Remark 11.2 and Lemma 11.6. We are going to show that

$$\mathcal{F}^{j+1} : D_{j+1} \times O_{j+1} \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}_j. \quad (11.272)$$

This implies

$$|\partial_t^p (P_j - P_{j-1}) \circ \mathcal{F}^{j+1}|_{j+1} \leq |\partial_t^p (P_j - P_{j-1})|_{\mathcal{U}_j} \leq \frac{\varepsilon_{j+1}}{2},$$

and we obtain  $H^j \circ \mathcal{F}^{j+1} = N_{j+1} + R_{j+1}$ , where  $|\partial_t^p R_{j+1}|_{j+1} \leq \varepsilon_{j+1}$  for  $0 \leq p \leq k \leq 1$ .

To prove (11.272) we note that

$$|\overline{W}_q \overline{W}_{q+1}^{-1}| = \sup \{s_{q+1}/s_q, r_{q+1}/r_q, h_{q+1}/h_q\} = s_{q+1}/s_q = \delta,$$

since  $r_{q+1}/r_q \leq \delta^{\tau+1} < \delta$  and  $h_{q+1}/h_q \leq \delta^{\tau+1} < \delta$  for any  $q \in \mathbb{N}$  by (11.248) and (11.253). Recall that  $\sigma_0$ ,  $\delta$  and  $E_0$  depend only on  $n$ ,  $\tau$  and  $\vartheta_0$ . Then using (11.254) and (11.270), we estimate the Jacobian of  $\mathcal{F}^{j+1}$  in  $D_{j+1} \times O_{j+1}$  as follows (see also [47])

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \overline{W}_0 D\mathcal{F}^{j+1} \overline{W}_j^{-1} \right|_{j+1} &= \left| \overline{W}_0 D(\mathcal{F}_0 \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{F}_j) \overline{W}_j^{-1} \right|_{j+1} \\ &\leq \prod_{q=0}^{j-1} \left( \left| \overline{W}_q D\mathcal{F}_q \overline{W}_q^{-1} \right|_{q+1} \left| \overline{W}_q \overline{W}_{q+1}^{-1} \right| \right) \left| \overline{W}_j D\mathcal{F}_j \overline{W}_j^{-1} \right|_{j+1} \\ &\leq \delta^j \prod_{k=0}^{\infty} \left( 1 + \frac{C\varepsilon_k}{r_k h_k} \right) \leq \delta^j \exp \left( \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{C\varepsilon_k}{r_k h_k} \right) \\ &\leq \delta^j \exp \left( C \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sigma_k^{\vartheta/2} \right) = \delta^j \exp \left( C \sigma_0^{\vartheta/2} (1 - \delta^{\vartheta/2})^{-1} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where  $C = C(n, \tau, \vartheta_0)$  stands for different positive constants depending only on  $n$ ,  $\tau$  and  $\vartheta_0$ . Choosing the parameter  $\sigma_0 = \sigma_0(n, \tau, \vartheta_0) > 0$  sufficiently small in Lemma 11.6 we obtain

$$\forall j \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \left| \overline{W}_0 D\mathcal{F}^{j+1} \overline{W}_j^{-1} \right|_{j+1} \leq 2\delta^j. \quad (11.273)$$

Set

$$z = (\theta, I, \omega) = x + iy \in D_{j+1} \times O_{j+1},$$

where  $x$  and  $y$  are respectively the real and the imaginary part of  $z$ . Then

$$\mathcal{F}^{j+1}(x + iy) = \mathcal{F}^{j+1}(x) + \overline{W}_0^{-1} T_{j+1}(x, y) \overline{W}_j y,$$

$$T_{j+1}(x, y) = i \int_0^1 \overline{W}_0 D\mathcal{F}^{j+1}(x + ity) \overline{W}_j^{-1} dt.$$

Moreover,  $|T_{j+1}(x, y)| \leq 2\delta^j$  and using that  $|\overline{W}_j y| \leq |\overline{W}_{j+1} y| \leq \sqrt{3}$  we get

$$|T_{j+1}(x, y) \overline{W}_j y| < 4\delta^j, \quad x + iy \in D_{j+1} \times O_{j+1}.$$

Since  $\mathcal{F}^{j+1}(x)$  is real valued, this implies  $\mathcal{F}^{j+1}(x + iy) \in \mathcal{U}_j$ , and we get (11.272).

It remains to prove (11.271). In the case when  $p = 0$  it follows from the arguments in [47]. Suppose now that  $p = k = 1$ . Denote by  $D\mathcal{F}^j(z)$  the differential of  $\mathcal{F}^j$  with respect to  $z = (\theta, I, \omega)$  acting on vectors  $\eta \in \mathbb{C}^{3n}$  by  $\eta \rightarrow D\mathcal{F}^{j-1}(z) \cdot \eta$ , and by  $(\xi, \eta) \rightarrow D^2\mathcal{F}^j(z)[\xi, \eta]$  the symmetric bilinear form corresponding to the second differential of  $\mathcal{F}^j$  at  $z$ . Consider

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t(\mathcal{F}^{j+1} - \mathcal{F}^j) &= \partial_t(\mathcal{F}^j \circ \mathcal{F}_j - \mathcal{F}^j) \\ &= \partial_t \int_0^1 D\mathcal{F}^j(x\mathcal{F}_j + (1-x)id) \cdot (\mathcal{F}_j - id) dx = \Sigma_1 + \Sigma_2 + \Sigma_3, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_1 &:= \int_0^1 D\mathcal{F}^j(x\mathcal{F}_j + (1-x)id) \cdot \partial_t \mathcal{F}_j dx, \\ \Sigma_2 &:= \int_0^1 D(\partial_t \mathcal{F}^j)(x\mathcal{F}_j + (1-x)id) \cdot (\mathcal{F}_j - id) dx, \\ \Sigma_3 &:= \int_0^1 D^2\mathcal{F}^j(x\mathcal{F}_j + (1-x)id) [x\partial_t \mathcal{F}_j, \mathcal{F}_j - id] dx. \end{aligned}$$

We are going to estimate  $\Sigma_j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq 3$ . By (11.269), (11.270) and (11.273) we get for any  $j \geq 1$

$$|\overline{W}_0 \Sigma_1|_{j+1} < \left| \overline{W}_0 D \mathcal{F}^j \overline{W}_j^{-1} \right|_j |\overline{W}_j \partial_t \mathcal{F}_j|_{j+1} < C_0 \delta^{j-1} \frac{\varepsilon_j}{r_j h_j}$$

since  $\left| W_{j-1} W_j^{-1} \right| \leq \delta < 1$ .

Consider  $\overline{W}_0 \Sigma_2$  now. Set  $\mathcal{F}^0 = \mathcal{F}_{-1} = id$  and put  $\mathcal{G}^q = \mathcal{F}_q \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{F}_{j-1}$  for  $q \leq j-1$  and  $\mathcal{G}^j = id$ . For  $j \geq 1$  we have

$$\partial_t \mathcal{F}^j = \partial_t (\mathcal{F}_0 \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{F}_{j-1}) = \sum_{q=0}^{j-1} D \mathcal{F}^q(\mathcal{G}^q) \cdot (\partial_t \mathcal{F}_q) \circ \mathcal{G}_{q+1}.$$

Using (11.269), (11.270) and (11.273) we get as above

$$\begin{aligned} |\overline{W}_0 \partial_t \mathcal{F}^j|_j &< \sum_{q=0}^{j-1} |\overline{W}_0 D \mathcal{F}^q W_q^{-1}|_q |\overline{W}_q \partial_t \mathcal{F}_q|_{q+1} \\ &\leq C \sum_{q=0}^j \frac{\varepsilon_q}{r_q h_q} \leq C \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} x_j^{\tau+1} \sigma_j^{\vartheta} \frac{\varepsilon_0}{r_0 h_0} \leq C \frac{\varepsilon_0}{r_0 h_0}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C$  stands for different constants depending only on  $n$ ,  $\tau$  and  $\vartheta_0$ . By Cauchy this implies

$$|\overline{W}_0 D \partial_t \mathcal{F}^j \overline{W}_j| \leq C \frac{\varepsilon_0}{r_0 h_0} \leq C_0$$

uniformly on  $\tilde{D}_j \times \tilde{O}_j \times [0, a]$ , and we get

$$|\overline{W}_0 \Sigma_2|_{j+1} \leq \sup_{\tilde{D}_j \times \tilde{O}_j \times [0, a]} \left| \overline{W}_0 D \partial_t \mathcal{F}^j \overline{W}_j^{-1} \right| |\overline{W}_j (\mathcal{F}_j - id)|_{j+1} \leq C \frac{\varepsilon_j}{r_j h_j}$$

where  $C = C(n, \tau, \vartheta_0)$  stands for different positive constants depending only on  $n$ ,  $\tau$  and  $\vartheta_0$ . In the same way, by (11.273) and Cauchy we get the estimate

$$\left| D^2 \overline{W}_0 \mathcal{F}^j(z) [W_j^{-1} \xi, W_j^{-1} \eta] \right| \leq C \frac{\varepsilon_0}{r_0 h_0} \|\xi\|_{\mathbb{C}^{3n}} \|\eta\|_{\mathbb{C}^{3n}}$$

uniformly in  $z \in \tilde{D}_j \times \tilde{O}_j$ ,  $t \in [0, a]$  and  $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{C}^{3n}$  and we obtain as above

$$|\overline{W}_0 \Sigma_3|_{j+1} \leq C \frac{\varepsilon_j^2}{(r_j h_j)^2},$$

which completes the proof of Proposition 11.8.  $\square$

We are ready to prove the statements (i) and (ii) of Theorem 10.1. Set

$$\mathcal{F}^j(\theta, I; \omega, t) = (\Phi^j(\theta, I; \omega, t), \phi^j(\omega, t))$$

where  $\Phi^j(\theta, I; \omega, t) = (U^j(\theta; \omega, t), V^j(\theta, I; \omega, t))$  and  $V^j$  is affine linear in  $I$  by construction. Set

$$\begin{cases} \Psi(\theta; \omega, t) = (U(\theta; \omega, t), V(\theta; \omega, t)) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \Phi^j(\theta, 0; \omega, t), \\ \phi(\omega, t) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \phi^j(\omega, t), \quad (\theta, \omega, t) \in \mathbb{T}^n \times \Omega_\kappa \times [0, 1]. \end{cases} \quad (11.274)$$

### 11.3 Proof of (i)

Choose  $\nu_j = \vartheta$  and  $\hat{\varepsilon}_j = \hat{\varepsilon}_0$  as in (11.262) (Case 1). As in Sect. 5.d, [47], we obtain that

$$|X_{H^j} \circ \mathcal{F}^j - D\Phi^j \cdot X_N| \leq \frac{c\varepsilon_j}{r_j h_j}$$

on  $\mathbb{T}^n \times \{0\} \times \Omega_\kappa$  for all  $j \geq 0$ , where  $X_{H^j}$  and  $X_N = \mathcal{L}_\omega$  stand for the Hamiltonian vector fields of  $H^j(\theta, I; \omega, t)$  and  $N(\theta, I; \omega) = \langle \omega, I \rangle$ , respectively. On the other hand,  $\nabla_{(\theta, I)} H^j$  converges uniformly to  $\nabla_{(\theta, I)} H$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$  in view of (11.255) and (11.256), hence,

$$X_{H(\cdot; \phi(\omega, t), t)} \circ \Psi(\cdot; \omega, t) = D\Psi(\cdot; \omega, t) \cdot \mathcal{L}_\omega$$

on  $\mathbb{T}^n \times \{0\} \times \Omega_\kappa$ . Moreover, by (11.270) and (11.252) we obtain as in the proof (11.254) that

$$|U_j(\cdot; \omega, t) - \text{id}|_{j+1} < \frac{C_0 \sigma_j \varepsilon_j}{r_j h_j} \leq C_1 \hat{\varepsilon}_0 x_j^{\tau+1} \sigma_j^{1+\vartheta} E_0 < C \hat{\varepsilon}_0 \sigma_j^{1+\vartheta/2} E_0$$

with some constants  $C_1, C > 0$  depending only on  $n, \tau$  and  $\vartheta_0$ . Then the Inverse Approximation Lemma A.3 implies that  $U(\cdot, \omega) = \lim U_j(\cdot, \omega)$  belongs to  $C^{1+\vartheta/2}(\mathbb{T}^n)$ . The corresponding Hölder norm is estimated by

$$\|U(\cdot; \omega, t) - \text{id}\|_{1+\vartheta/2} < C(n, \tau, \vartheta_0) E_0 \hat{\varepsilon}_0 \leq C(n, \tau, \vartheta_0) E_0 \ll 1$$

choosing  $E_0$  small enough in a function of  $n, \tau$  and  $\vartheta_0$ , hence,  $U(\cdot, \omega, t)$  is an embedding. Moreover,  $U(\cdot, \omega, \cdot) \in C^k([0, 1], C^{1+\vartheta/2}(\mathbb{T}^n))$ . Then

$$t \rightarrow \{\Psi(\theta; \omega, t) : \theta \in \mathbb{T}^n\}$$

is a  $C^k$  family of embedded invariant tori of the Hamiltonians  $(\theta, I) \rightarrow H(\theta, I; \phi(\omega, t), t)$  with frequency  $\omega \in \Omega_\kappa$ . They are Lagrangian by construction (see also [20], Sect. I.3.2). In particular, we prove Remark 10.3, 2 (recall that  $\vartheta = \vartheta_0/3$ ).

### 11.4 Inverse Approximate Lemma and proof of (ii)

We are going to prove that the limit of  $\mathcal{F}^j$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$  gives a smooth function on  $\mathbb{T}^n \times \Omega_\kappa \times [0, 1]$  in a Whitney sens. To this end we use a suitable Inverse Approximation Lemma (cf [46], [59] Lemma 4, [60] Lemma 4).

We are going to show that the limits (11.274) define Whitney jets in  $C^k([0, a], C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^n \times \Omega_\kappa))$ . Recall that

$$\mathbb{T}_j^n := \{\theta \in \mathbb{C}^n / \mathbb{Z}^n : |\text{Im } \theta| < s_j/2\}, \quad \tilde{D}_j = \mathbb{T}_j^n \times \{I \in \mathbb{C}^n : |I| < r_j/2\},$$

$$\tilde{O}_j = \{\omega \in \mathbb{C}^n : |\omega - \Omega_\kappa| < h_j/2\}.$$

For any  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  we denote by  $\mathcal{S}_j$  the jet  $\left(S_j^\beta\right)_{\beta \in \mathbb{N}^n}$ , where

$$S_j^\beta(t, \theta, \omega) := \partial_\omega^\beta \mathcal{F}^{j+1}(\theta, 0; \omega, t) - \partial_\omega^\beta \mathcal{F}^j(\theta, 0; \omega, t), \quad (t, \theta, \omega) \in [0, a] \times \mathbb{T}_{j+1}^n \times \tilde{O}_{j+1}.$$

We set as above

$$\begin{cases} (T_\omega^N \mathcal{S}_j)_\beta(t, \theta, \omega') := \sum_{|\beta+\gamma| \leq N} (\omega' - \omega)^\gamma S_j^{\beta+\gamma}(t, \theta, \omega) / \gamma! \\ (R_\omega^N \mathcal{S}_j)_\beta(t, \theta, \omega') := S_j^\beta(t, \theta, \omega') - (T_\omega^N \mathcal{S}_j)_\beta(t, \theta, \omega'), \end{cases}$$

Fix  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and choose the numbers  $\nu_j$  and  $\hat{\varepsilon}_j$  as in (11.264) (Case 2).

**Lemma 11.9** (*Inverse Approximation Lemma*) *Under the assumptions of Proposition 11.8 we have the following estimates*

$$\begin{cases} |\overline{W}_0 \partial_t^p \partial_\theta^\alpha S_j^\beta(t, \theta, \omega)| \leq \sigma_{j+1}^\vartheta x_{j+1}^{(|\beta|+1)(\tau+1)} \frac{CE_0}{\kappa^{|\beta|+1} r} \sum_{p=0}^k \|\partial_t^p P_t\|_{\ell(m); r, \kappa}, \\ \text{for } |\alpha| + |\beta|(\tau+1) \leq m(\tau+1) \end{cases}$$

and  $(t, \theta, \omega) \in [0, a] \times \mathbb{T}_{j+1}^n \times \tilde{O}_{j+1}$ , and

$$\begin{cases} |\overline{W}_0 \partial_t^p \partial_\theta^\alpha (R_\omega^q \mathcal{S}_j)_\beta(t, \theta, \omega')| \leq \sigma_{j+1}^\vartheta x_{j+1}^{\tau+1} |\omega - \omega'|^{q+|\beta|+1} \frac{CE_0}{\kappa^{q+|\beta|+1} r} \sum_{p=0}^k \|\partial_t^p P_t\|_{\ell(m); r, \kappa}, \\ \text{for } |\alpha| + (q + |\beta| + 1)(\tau+1) \leq m(\tau+1), \end{cases}$$

and  $(t, \theta) \in [0, a] \times \mathbb{T}^n$ ,  $\omega, \omega' \in \Omega_\kappa$ , and for any  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , where  $C > 0$  depends only on  $m$ ,  $n$ ,  $\tau$  and  $\vartheta$ .

*Proof.* Using (11.271) and applying the Cauchy estimate (11.207) to the analytic function

$$(\theta, \omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}^j(\theta, \omega, t)$$

in  $\mathbb{T}_{j+1}^n \times \tilde{O}_{j+1} \subset D_{j+1} \times O_{j+1}$ , we evaluate  $\partial_t^p \partial_\theta^\alpha S_j^\beta$  for any  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^n$  in  $\mathbb{T}_{j+1}^n \times \tilde{O}_{j+1}$  by

$$\left| \overline{W}_0 \partial_t^p \partial_\theta^\alpha S_j^\beta(t, \theta, \omega) \right| \leq C_0 \alpha! \beta! 2^{|\alpha|+|\beta|} \frac{\varepsilon_j}{r_j h_j s_{j+1}^{|\alpha|} h_{j+1}^{|\beta|}}, \quad (11.275)$$

where  $C_{\alpha, \beta}$  is a positive constant depending only on  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $n$ ,  $\tau$  and  $\vartheta_0$ . Given  $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$  we set

$$\tilde{\varepsilon}_{j,p,q} := \frac{\varepsilon_j}{r_j h_j s_{j+1}^p h_{j+1}^q}.$$

By (11.246), (11.249), (11.250), and (11.264) we get for  $j \geq j(m)$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\varepsilon}_{j,\mu,\nu} &= \frac{\varepsilon_j}{r_j h_j s_{j+1}^p h_{j+1}^q} = \hat{\varepsilon}_j \kappa \frac{\sigma_j^{\tau+1} E_j}{h_j s_{j+1}^p h_{j+1}^q} \\ &= C_{m,p} \hat{\varepsilon}_j \kappa \frac{\sigma_j^{\tau+1} \sigma_{j+1}^{m(\tau+1)+\vartheta/2-\mu}}{h_j h_{j+1}^q}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$C_{m,p} := E_0 (\sigma_0 \delta)^{-m(\tau+1)-\vartheta/2} \left( \frac{1-\delta}{5} \right)^p$$

depends only on  $m, p, \tau, n$  and  $\vartheta_0$ . On the other hand, using (11.251) and (11.252) (the sequence  $\{x_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  is increasing) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} h_j h_{j+1}^q &= \left(\frac{\kappa}{2}\right)^{q+1} K_j^{-(\tau+1)} K_{j+1}^{-q(\tau+1)} \\ &= \left(\frac{\kappa}{2}\right)^{q+1} \left(\frac{\sigma_j}{x_j}\right)^{\tau+1} \left(\frac{\sigma_{j+1}}{x_{j+1}}\right)^{q(\tau+1)} > \left(\frac{\kappa}{2}\right)^{q+1} \sigma_j^{\tau+1} \sigma_{j+1}^{q(\tau+1)} x_{j+1}^{-(q+1)(\tau+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$\tilde{\varepsilon}_{j,p,q} < C_{m,p,q} E_0 \hat{\varepsilon}_j \kappa^{-q} \sigma_{j+1}^{M_{p,q}} x_{j+1}^{(p+1)(\tau+1)} \quad \text{where} \quad M_{p,q} := (m-q)(\tau+1) - p + \vartheta/2 \quad (11.276)$$

and  $C_{m,p,q}$  depends only on  $m, p, q, n, \tau$  and  $\vartheta_0$ .

Let  $|\alpha| + |\beta|(\tau+1) \leq m(\tau+1)$ . Then  $M_{|\alpha|,|\beta|} \geq \vartheta/2$  and (11.275) and (11.276) yield

$$\left| \overline{W}_0 \partial_t^p \partial_\theta^\alpha S_j^\beta(t, \theta, \omega) \right| \leq C_m E_0 \hat{\varepsilon}_j \kappa^{-|\beta|} \sigma_{j+1}^{\vartheta/2} x_{j+1}^{(|\beta|+1)(\tau+1)} \quad (11.277)$$

where and  $C_m > 0$  depends only on  $m, n, \tau$  and  $\vartheta_0$ . Using (11.267) we get the first estimate.

We are going to prove the second estimate for  $\omega, \omega' \in \Omega_\kappa$ . Suppose firstly that  $|\omega' - \omega| \leq h_{j+1}/4$ . Expanding the analytic in  $O_{j+1}$  function  $\omega' \rightarrow \partial_t^p \partial_\theta^\alpha \partial_\omega^\beta S_j^0(t, \theta, \omega')$  in Taylor series at  $\omega' = \omega$  and using the Cauchy estimates (11.207) as in (11.275) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} A &:= |\overline{W}_0 \partial_t^p \partial_\theta^\alpha (R_\omega^q \mathcal{S}_j)_\beta(t, \theta, \omega')| \\ &\leq \sum_{|\gamma| \geq q+1} |\omega' - \omega|^{|\gamma|} \left| \overline{W}_0 \partial_t^p \partial_\theta^\alpha S_j^{\beta+\gamma}(t, \theta, \omega') \right| / \gamma! \\ &\leq \sum_{|\gamma| \geq q+1} |\omega' - \omega|^{|\gamma|} \frac{C_0 \alpha! (\beta + \gamma)! \varepsilon_j}{r_j h_j s_{j+1}^{|\alpha|} h_{j+1}^{|\beta+\gamma|} \gamma!} \\ &\leq C_0 2^{q+|\beta|+1} \alpha! \beta! |\omega' - \omega|^{q+1} \frac{\varepsilon_j}{r_j h_j s_{j+1}^{|\alpha|} h_{j+1}^{q+|\beta|+1}} \\ &\quad \times \sum_{|\gamma| \geq q+1} \left( 2 |\omega' - \omega| h_{j+1}^{-1} \right)^{|\gamma|-q-1} \\ &\leq C_{q,\alpha,\beta} \kappa^{-(|\beta|+q+1)} |\omega - \omega'|^{q+1} \tilde{\varepsilon}_{j,|\alpha|,q+|\beta|+1}. \end{aligned}$$

for  $\theta \in \mathbb{T}^n$ ,  $\omega, \omega' \in \Omega_\kappa$ . We have used the estimate  $(\beta + \gamma)! (\beta! \gamma!)^{-1} \leq 2^{|\beta+\gamma|}$ .

Let  $|\alpha| + (q + |\beta| + 1)(\tau+1) \leq m(\tau+1)$ . Then (11.276) implies

$$A \leq C_m E_0 \hat{\varepsilon}_j \kappa^{-(q+|\beta|+1)} |\omega - \omega'|^{q+1} \sigma_{j+1}^{\vartheta/2} x_{j+1}^{(m+2)(\tau+1)}.$$

The constant  $C_m$  depends only on  $m, n, \tau$  and  $\vartheta_0$ . If  $|\omega' - \omega| \geq h_{j+1}/4$  we obtain the same inequality estimating  $\partial_t^p \partial_\theta^\alpha (R_\omega^q \mathcal{S}_j)_\beta$  term by term and using (11.277). Using (11.267) we get the second estimate. This proves the lemma.  $\square$

The sequences  $\{\varepsilon_j\}$ ,  $\{\eta_j\}$  and  $\{r_j\}$  depend on  $m$ . The following important remark shows that the functions  $S_j^\beta$  are independent of the choice of  $m$ .

**Remark 11.10** The sequences  $\{\varepsilon_j\}$ ,  $\{\eta_j\}$  and  $\{r_j\}$  in (11.248)-(11.250) depend on the choice of  $\{\nu_j\}$  and  $\{\hat{\varepsilon}_j\}$  which is made in Case 1 and Case 2 and consequently on  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  but the restrictions of the corresponding functions  $(t, \theta, \omega) \rightarrow S_j^\beta(t, \theta, \omega)$ ,  $j \geq 0$ ,  $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^n$ , on the set  $[0, a] \times \mathbb{T}^n \times \Omega_\kappa$  is independent of it. In particular,  $S_j^\beta(t, \theta, \omega, \cdot)$ ,  $(t, \theta, \omega, t) \in \mathbb{T}^n \times \Omega_\kappa \times [0, a]$  does not depend on  $m$ .

Indeed, for any  $t \in [0, a]$  the corresponding functions  $(\theta, I; \omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_j(\theta, I; \omega, t)$  coincide by construction on the intersection of the corresponding open complex neighborhoods  $\tilde{D}_j \times \tilde{O}_j$  of  $\mathbb{T}^n \times \{0\} \times \Omega_\kappa$ .

**Remark 11.11** The inequality (11.252) implies that the following series is convergent

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sigma_j^{\vartheta/2} x_j^b = C(n, \tau, \vartheta, b)$$

for any  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ . Moreover, its sum depends only on  $n$ ,  $\tau$ ,  $\vartheta = \vartheta_0/3$  and  $b$ .

According to Proposition 11.8, Lemma 11.9 and Remark 11.11, the limit

$$\partial_t^p \partial_\theta^\alpha \mathcal{H}^\beta(\theta; \omega, t) := \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \partial_t^p \partial_\theta^\alpha \partial_\omega^\beta [\mathcal{F}^j(\theta, 0; \omega, t) - (\theta, 0; \omega)] , \quad (\theta, \omega) \in \mathbb{T}^n \times \Omega_\kappa, \quad t \in [0, a],$$

exists for each  $0 \leq q \leq k$  and  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}$  and it is uniform. Moreover, the partial derivatives of  $\mathcal{H}^\beta$  exist, they are continuous on  $\mathbb{T}^n \times \Omega_\kappa \times [0, a]$ , and  $\partial_t^p \partial_\theta^\alpha (\mathcal{H}^\beta) = \partial_t^p \partial_\theta^\alpha \mathcal{H}^\beta$ . By Remark 11.10 the jet  $\mathcal{H}^\beta$  does not depend on  $m$ . To get rid of the exponents of  $\kappa^{-1}$  in Lemma 11.9 we make a partial dilation  $\omega \rightarrow \kappa\omega$ . More precisely, denote  $X := \mathbb{T}^n \times \kappa\Omega_\kappa$ , where  $\kappa\Omega_\kappa = \{w = \kappa\omega : \omega \in \Omega_\kappa\}$ , and consider the jet

$$\mathcal{H} = \left( \mathcal{H}^{(\alpha, \beta)} \right)_{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{N}^{2n}} \in C^k([0, a], C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^n \times \Omega_\kappa))$$

where

$$\mathcal{H}^{(\alpha, \beta)}(t, \theta, w) = \kappa^{-|\beta|} \partial_\theta^\alpha \mathcal{H}^\beta(\theta; \kappa^{-1}w, t), \quad (t, \theta, w) \in [0, a] \times X.$$

The jet  $\mathcal{H}$  does not depend on  $m$  since  $\mathcal{H}^\beta$  is independent of  $m$  on  $[0, a] \times X$ . Set  $x = (\theta, w) \in X$  and  $\gamma = (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{N}^{2n}$ , and denote

$$\langle P \rangle_{p, \ell; r, \kappa} := \sup_{0 \leq q \leq p} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq a} \|\partial_t^q P_t\|_{\ell; r, \kappa}.$$

Then for any integer  $m \geq 1$  we get by Lemma 11.9 and (11.267) the following estimates

$$\begin{cases} |\overline{W}_0 \partial_t^p \mathcal{H}^{(\gamma)}(t, x)| & \leq C_m(\kappa r)^{-1} \langle P_t \rangle_{p, \ell(m); r, \kappa} \quad \text{for } |\gamma| \leq m, \\ |\overline{W}_0 (R_x^q \partial_t^p \mathcal{H})_\gamma(t, y)| & \leq C_m(\kappa r)^{-1} \langle P_t \rangle_{p, \ell(m); r, \kappa} |x - y|^{m+1-|\gamma|} \quad \text{for } q + |\gamma| \leq m - 1 \end{cases} \quad (11.278)$$

and for each  $0 \leq p \leq k$  and  $x, y \in X$ , where  $C_m > 0$  depends only on  $k$ ,  $m$ ,  $n$ ,  $\tau$  and  $\vartheta_0$ . Then using Theorem A.15 we extend the Whitney jet  $\mathcal{H}$  to a smooth function  $\mathcal{H}$  on  $[0, a] \times \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$  such that

$$|\overline{W}_0 \partial_t^p \partial_x^\gamma \mathcal{H}(t, x)| \leq B_m(\kappa r)^{-1} \sup_{0 \leq q \leq p} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq a} \|\partial_t^q P_t\|_{\ell(m); r, \kappa}$$

for  $0 \leq q \leq p$  and  $|\gamma| \leq m$ . Moreover,  $B_m$  depends only on  $k$ ,  $m$ ,  $n$ ,  $\tau$  and  $\vartheta_0$ .

Recall that  $\overline{W}_0 = \text{diag}(\sigma_0^{-1} \text{Id}, r^{-1} \text{Id}, h_0^{-1} \text{Id})$  and that  $h_0 = \kappa(\sigma_0/x_0)^{\tau+1}/2 < \kappa$ . Then setting  $\Psi_t(\theta, \omega) = \mathcal{H}(t, \theta, \kappa\omega) + (\theta, \omega)$  we get (ii), Theorem 10.1.  $\square$

## A Appendix.

### A.1 Approximation Lemma

The Hamiltonian  $P_t$  is not analytic and one can not apply directly the KAM step to it. We are going to approximate it by real analytic functions. To this end we recall some facts about the analytic smoothing technique invented by Moser [42], [43], and developed in different situations by Zehnder [65], Pöschel [46], Salamon [59] and Salamon and Zehnder [60]. The Approximation Lemma and the Inverse Approximation Lemma characterize Hölder classes of differentiable functions in terms of quantitative estimates of approximating sequences of analytic functions. Let  $\ell = k + \mu \notin \mathbb{N}$  be a positive number, where  $k = [\ell] \in \mathbb{N}$  is the entire part of  $\ell$  and  $0 < \mu < 1$  the residual one. Let  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be an open set. The Hölder space  $C^\ell(U)$  consists of all  $f \in C^k(U)$  such that

$$\|f\|_{C^\ell(U)} := \sup(\|f\|_{C^k(U)}, H_{k,\mu}(f)) < \infty \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where

$$\|f\|_{C^k(U)} := \sup_{|\alpha| \leq k} \sup_{x \in U} |\partial^\alpha f(x)| \quad (\text{A.2})$$

is the  $C^k$  norm of  $f$ . Moreover,

$$H_{k,\mu}(f) := \sup \frac{|\partial^\alpha f(x) - \partial^\alpha f(y)|}{|x - y|^\mu} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where the supremum is taken over all  $x, y \in U$  such that  $x \neq y$  and all  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$  of length  $|\alpha| = \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_n = k$ . We set as well  $\|f\|_\ell = \|f\|_{C^\ell(U)}$  when the open set  $U$  is fixed. Denote by

$$(T_x^k f)(y) := \sum_{|\alpha| \leq k} \partial^\alpha f(x) y^\alpha / \alpha!$$

the Taylor polynomial of  $f$  up to order  $k$ . Given  $\rho > 0$  and an open set  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  we denote by  $U_\rho$  the strip of all  $x + iy \in \mathbb{C}^n$  such that  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $x \in U$  and  $|y| < \rho$ . Recall that  $\mathcal{A}(U_\rho)$  is the space of analytic functions on  $U_\rho$ . We denote by  $|\cdot|_\rho$  the sup-norm on  $U_\rho$ . Recall that  $f$  is real analytic on  $U_\rho$  if  $f$  is analytic on  $U_\rho$  and real valued on  $U$ . In this Section we take  $U = \mathbb{R}^n$ . The space of entire functions  $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{C}^n)$  is endowed by the inductive topology generated by the sup-norms on compact sets of  $\mathbb{C}^n$ .

**Lemma A.1 (Approximation Lemma)** ([59],[60]). *There is a real analytic function  $K \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{C}^n)$  generating a family of convolution operators*

$$S_r f(x) := r^{-n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} K(r^{-1}(x - y)) f(y) dy, \quad 0 < r \leq 1, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

from  $C^0(\mathbb{R}^n)$  to  $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{C}^n)$  with the following properties.

1. For any  $\ell \geq 0$  there is a constant  $c = c(n, \ell) > 0$  such that, for every  $f \in C^\ell(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , any  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n$  of length  $|\alpha| \leq \ell$  and any  $x = u + iv \in \mathbb{C}^n$ ,  $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^n$  with  $|v| < r$ , we have

$$\left| \partial^\alpha S_r(u + iv) - (T_u^{[\ell] - |\alpha|} \partial^\alpha f)(iv) \right| \leq cr^{\ell - |\alpha|} \|f\|_\ell, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

and in particular for  $0 < \rho < r \leq 1$ ,

$$|\partial^\alpha S_r f - \partial^\alpha S_\rho f|_\rho \leq cr^{\ell - |\alpha|} \|f\|_\ell. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

2. The restriction of  $S_r f$  to  $\mathbb{R}^n$  satisfies

$$\|S_r f - f\|_s \leq cr^{\ell-s} \|f\|_\ell, \quad 0 \leq s \leq \ell. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

3. The function  $S_r f$  is real analytic whenever  $f$  is real valued. Moreover, if  $f$  is periodic in some variables then so is  $S_r f$  in the same variables.

4. If  $[0, 1] \ni t \mapsto f_t \in C^\ell(\mathbb{R}^n)$  is a  $C^k$  family, then for any  $r > 0$  fixed, the family

$$[0, 1] \ni t \mapsto S_r f_t \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{C}^n)$$

is  $C^k$  as well.

A complete proof of the claims 1.-3. is given for example in [59], Lemma 3. The claim 4. follows easily from the properties of  $K$ .

Set  $x = (x', x'') \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_2}$ ,  $n = n_1 + n_2$ . Given  $0 < r_1, r_2 \leq 1$  denote

$$S_{r_1, r_2} f(x', x'') := \frac{1}{r_1^{n_1} r_2^{n_2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_2}} K\left(\frac{x' - y'}{r_1}\right) K\left(\frac{x'' - y''}{r_2}\right) f(y', y'') dy' dy''.$$

Given  $\rho', \rho'' > 0$  we consider the strip of all  $(x' + iy', x'' + iy'') \in \mathbb{C}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{C}^{n_2}$  such that  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $|y'| < \rho'$  and  $|y''| < \rho''$  and denote by  $|\cdot|_{r', r''}$  the sup-norm on it.

**Remark A.2** Denote by  $\sigma_a : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  the partial dilation  $\sigma_a(x', x'') = (x', ax'')$ . Then

$$(S_{r, ar} f) \circ \sigma_a = S_{r, r}(f \circ \sigma_a). \quad (\text{A.8})$$

In particular, if  $0 < a \leq 1$  and  $0 < \rho < r \leq 1$ , then we obtain

$$|S_{r, ar} f - S_{\rho, a\rho} f|_{\rho, a\rho} \leq cr^\ell \|f\|_{\ell; a}. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

The proof of (A.8) is immediate. Moreover, by (A.6) and (A.8) we get

$$\begin{aligned} |S_{r, ar} f - S_{\rho, a\rho} f|_{\rho, a\rho} &= |(S_{r, ar} f - S_{\rho, a\rho} f) \circ \sigma_a|_{\rho, \rho} \\ &= |S_{r, ar}(f \circ \sigma_a) - S_{\rho, a\rho}(f \circ \sigma_a)|_{\rho, \rho} \leq cr^\ell \|f \circ \sigma_a\|_\ell = cr^\ell \|f\|_{\ell; a}. \end{aligned}$$

This inequality is quite useful when  $a$  is a small parameter.

We recall also the inverse approximation lemma (see [59], [60]).

**Lemma A.3 (Inverse Approximation Lemma).** Let  $\ell > 0$  be not an integer  $u_j = u_0 \delta^j$  and  $f_j$ ,  $j \geq 0$ ,  $f_0 = 0$ , be a sequence of real analytic functions in the strip  $V_j := \{x + iy : x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n, |y| \leq u_j\}$  i.e.  $f_j \in A(V_j)$ . Suppose that

$$\forall j \geq 1 : |f_j - f_{j-1}|_{u_j} \leq C u_j^\ell$$

and set  $f(x) = \lim f_j(x)$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Then  $f \in C^\ell(\mathbb{R})$  and there is a positive constant  $c_0 = c_0(\ell, n)$  such that for any  $0 \leq s \leq \ell$  not integer

$$\|f\|_s \leq \frac{c_0 C}{\{s\}(1 - \{s\})} u_0^{\ell-s},$$

where  $\{s\} = s - [s] \in (0, 1)$  is the fractional part of  $s$ . Moreover, if  $f_j \in C^k([0, 1], A(V_j))$ , then  $f \in C^k([0, 1], C^\ell(\mathbb{R}))$ .

## A.2 Higher order Hölder estimates of a composition and of the inverse function.

### A.2.1 Estimates of the composition and the inverse function.

The aim of this section is to obtain estimates of the composition and the inverse function in certain Hölder norms with constants depending only on the dimension of the spaces and the Hölder exponent. We start by introducing certain semi-norms as follows. Hereafter we denote the Euclidean norm of  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  by  $|x|$ . Given  $\ell \in \mathbb{R}$ , denote by  $[\ell] \in \mathbb{R}$  the entire part of  $\ell$  and set  $\{\ell\} := \ell - [\ell] \in [0, 1)$ . Given  $f \in C^\ell(U)$ , where  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is an open set, we introduce a  $\ell$ -semi-norm of  $f$  by

$$|f|_{\ell,U} := \begin{cases} \sup_{|\alpha|=\ell, x \in U} |\partial^\alpha f(x)| & , \quad \text{if } \ell \in \mathbb{N}; \\ H_{[\ell],\{\ell\}}(f) & , \quad \text{if } \ell \notin \mathbb{N}. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

where the semi-norm  $H_{k,\mu}(f)$  is defined by (A.3). To simplify the notations we often write  $|f|_\ell := |f|_{\ell,U}$ . This notation should not be confused with the sup-norm in Sect. A.1. The  $\mu$ -semi-norm of the product of two functions  $f, g \in C^\mu(U)$  with  $0 < \mu < 1$  can be estimated by

$$|fg|_\mu \leq |f|_\mu |g|_0 + |f|_0 |g|_\mu. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

More generally, for any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $0 \leq \mu < 1$ , and  $f, g \in C^{m+\mu}(U)$  we have

$$|fg|_{m+\mu} \leq C_m \sum_{k=0}^m \left( |f|_{k+\mu} |g|_{m-k} + |f|_k |g|_{m-k+\mu} \right). \quad (\text{A.12})$$

where  $C_m$  depends only on  $m$  and on the dimension  $n$ .

Given  $\ell \geq 1$ ,  $f \in C^\ell(U)$  and an integer  $1 \leq m \leq \ell$  we set

$$\mathcal{P}_U^{\ell,m}(f) := \sup_{\substack{\delta_1 + \dots + \delta_m = \{\ell\} \\ \inf \delta_j \geq 0}} \sum_{\Delta(\ell,m)} |f|_{k_1+\delta_1} \cdots |f|_{k_m+\delta_m} \quad (\text{A.13})$$

where the  $|f|_\alpha := |f|_{\alpha,U}$  and the index set  $\Delta(\ell, m)$  consists of all

$$(k_1, \dots, k_j, \dots, k_m) \in \mathbb{N}^m$$

such that

$$k_1 + \dots + k_m = [\ell], \quad \min_{1 \leq j \leq m} k_j \geq 1.$$

In particular,

$$\mathcal{P}_U^{\ell,m}(f) := \sum_{\Delta(\ell,m)} |f|_{k_1} \cdots |f|_{k_m}$$

when  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_*$ . Notice that

$$\mathcal{P}_U^{\ell,m}(f) \mathcal{P}_U^{\ell',m'}(f) \leq C_{\ell,\ell'} \mathcal{P}_U^{\ell+\ell',m+m'}(f), \quad \mathcal{P}_U^{\ell,m}(f) \mathcal{P}_U^{\ell',m'}(g) \leq C_{\ell,\ell'} \mathcal{P}_U^{\ell+\ell',m+m'}((f,g)) \quad (\text{A.14})$$

where  $C_{\ell,\ell'} \geq 1$  depends only on  $\ell$  and  $\ell'$ . Set

$$\mathcal{P}_U^\ell(f) := \sum_{m=1}^{[\ell]} \mathcal{P}_U^{\ell,m}(f).$$

Denote the set of positive integers by  $\mathbb{N}_* := \mathbb{N} \setminus 0$ .

**Proposition A.4** . Let  $f_j \in C^\ell(U_j, U_{j+1})$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ , where  $\ell \geq 1$  and  $U_j \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_j}$  are open sets such that  $f_1(U_1) \subset U_2$ . Then the following holds:

1. If  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_*$  then

$$|f_2 \circ f_1|_{\ell, U_1} \leq C_\ell \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} |f_2|_{m, U_2} \mathcal{P}_{U_1}^{\ell, m}(f_1)$$

where the constant  $C_\ell$  depends only on  $\ell$  and on the dimensions  $n_j$ ,  $j = 1, 2, 3$ .

2. If  $\ell \in [1, \infty)$  and  $U_1$  is convex, then

$$\begin{aligned} |f_2 \circ f_1|_{\ell, U_1} &\leq C_\ell \left(1 + |f_1|_{1, U_1}^{\{\ell\}}\right) \\ &\times \sum_{m=1}^{[\ell]} \left(|f_2|_{m+\{\ell\}, U_2} \mathcal{P}_{U_1}^{[\ell], m}(f_1) + |f_2|_{m, U_2} \mathcal{P}_{U_1}^{\ell, m}(f_1)\right) \end{aligned}$$

where the constant  $C_\ell$  depends only on  $[\ell]$  and on the dimensions  $n_j$ ,  $j = 1, 2, 3$ .

*Proof.* The statement 1. follows directly from the Faa di Bruno formula

$$\partial^\alpha (f_2 \circ f_1) = \sum \frac{(\partial^\beta f_2) \circ f_1}{\beta!} (\partial^{\alpha_1} f_1) \cdots (\partial^{\alpha_m} f_1) \frac{\alpha_1! \cdots \alpha_m!}{\alpha!}$$

where the summation is over all the indices

$$m \in \mathbb{N}_*, \quad \beta \in \mathbb{N}^{n_2}, \quad (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) \in \underbrace{\mathbb{N}^{n_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{N}^{n_1}}_m = \mathbb{N}^{n_1 m}$$

such that

$$1 \leq |\beta| = m \leq |\alpha|, \quad \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_m = \alpha, \quad \min_{1 \leq j \leq m} |\alpha_j| \geq 1.$$

Here  $|\beta| = \beta_1 + \dots + \beta_{n_2}$  stands for the length of  $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^{n_2}$ .

We are going to prove 2. Suppose now that  $U_1$  is convex and that  $\ell = m + \mu$  where  $m \in \mathbb{N}_*$  and  $0 < \mu < 1$ . In order to estimate  $|\partial^\alpha (f_2 \circ f_1)|_\mu$ , where  $|\alpha| = m$ , we firstly apply (A.11) to the product in the Faa di Bruno formula and then we use the inequality

$$|f_1(x) - f_1(y)| \leq |f_1|_{1, U} |x - y|$$

which is valid for any  $x, y \in U_1$  since  $U_1$  is *convex*. In this way we obtain

$$|(\partial^\beta f_2) \circ f_1|_{\mu, U_1} \leq |\partial^\beta f_2|_{\mu, U_2} |f_1|_{1, U_1}^\mu.$$

This implies 2. □

Similar inequalities can be proven for compensated domains  $U_1$  ([36], Theorem 5.4) but then the constants depend on  $U_1$ .

**Proposition A.5** Let  $\ell \geq 1$  and let  $f \in C^{\ell+1}(U, V)$  be a diffeomorphism with inverse  $g = f^{-1}$ , where  $U$  and  $V$  are open subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $n \geq 1$ . Then the following holds:

1. If  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  then

$$\|dg\|_{\ell,V} \leq C_\ell \left(1 + \|(df)^{-1}\|_{C^0(U)}^{\ell+1}\right) \mathcal{P}_U^\ell(df)$$

where  $C_\ell > 0$  depends only on  $\ell$  and on the dimension  $n$ .

2. Let  $V = f(U)$  be convex. Then

$$\|dg\|_{C^\ell(V)} \leq C_\ell \left(1 + \|(df)^{-1}\|_{C^0(U)}^{\ell+2}\right) \mathcal{P}_U^\ell(df).$$

for any  $\ell \geq 0$ , where  $C_\ell > 0$  depends only on  $\ell$  and on the dimension  $n$ .

*Proof.* Given  $f \in C^\ell(U, V)$ , where  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_1}$  and  $V \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_2}$  are open, we denote by  $Df(x) \in M_{n_2, n_1}(\mathbb{R})$  the value of corresponding Jacobian matrix at  $x \in U$ . To prove the statement one needs a sort of Lagrange inversion formula for higher derivatives of  $Dg \in C^\infty(U, M_n(\mathbb{R}))$ . Hereafter  $M_n(\mathbb{R}) = M_{n,n}(\mathbb{R})$  is the space of real  $n \times n$  matrices equipped with the corresponding sup-norm and we denote by  $A \cdot B$  is the product of two matrices  $A$  and  $B$ . Denote by  $L_p : M_n(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow M_{1,n}(\mathbb{R})$  the linear operator which assigns to each matrix  $A \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$  its  $p^{th}$ -line and by  $C_q : M_n(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow M_{n,1}(\mathbb{R})$  the linear operator which assigns to each matrix  $A \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$  its  $q^{th}$ -column. We identify  $L_p$  and  $C_q$  with the corresponding matrices in  $M_{1,n}(\mathbb{R})$  and  $M_{n,1}(\mathbb{R})$ , respectively. Since  $(Dg)(f(x)) = Df(x)^{-1}$ , where  $Df(x)^{-1}$  is the inverse of the matrices  $Df(x)$ , we get for any  $1 \leq p, q \leq n$  the equality

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_q} g_p\right)(y) = L_p \cdot Df(x)^{-1} \cdot C_q \in \mathbb{R} \quad \text{as } y = f(x). \quad (\text{A.15})$$

Then differentiating the identity  $Dg(y) = (Df)^{-1}(g(y))$  with respect to  $y_q$  we obtain

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_q} Dg\right)(y) = \sum_{p=1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial x_p} (Df(x)^{-1}) \cdot (L_p \cdot Df(x)^{-1} \cdot C_q) I_n \quad \text{as } x = g(y).$$

Denote by  $\mathcal{A}$  the set of automorphisms of  $M_n(\mathbb{R})$  generated under composition by the identity map the automorphisms of the form

$$A \mapsto (L_p \cdot A \cdot C_q) I_n, \quad A \in M_n(\mathbb{R}).$$

Using (A.15) we obtain by induction that for any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n$  with  $|\alpha| = m$  the following identity holds

$$\partial_y^\alpha Dg(y) = \sum_{\gamma \in \Delta_\alpha} c_\gamma \prod_{1 \leq j \leq m+1} \mathcal{L}_j(\partial_x^{\gamma_j} (Df(x)^{-1})) \quad \text{as } x = g(y), \quad (\text{A.16})$$

where the index set  $\Delta_\alpha$  consists of all  $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{m+1}) \in \mathbb{N}^n \times \dots \times \mathbb{N}^n = (\mathbb{N}^n)^{m+1}$  such that

$$|\gamma_1| + \dots + |\gamma_{m+1}| = m = |\alpha|,$$

$c_\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$  are universal constants, and  $\mathcal{L}_j \in \mathcal{A}$ . Consider the derivatives of  $Df(x)^{-1}$ . One can easily show that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_p} (Df(x)^{-1}) = -Df(x)^{-1} \cdot \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_p} Df(x)\right) \cdot Df(x)^{-1}. \quad (\text{A.17})$$

This equality implies by induction that for any  $0 \neq \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n$ ,

$$\partial_x^\alpha (Df(x)^{-1}) = \sum_{\gamma \in \Delta_\alpha^1} c_\gamma \left( \prod_{1 \leq j \leq |\alpha|} Df(x)^{-1} \cdot \partial_x^{\gamma_j} Df(x) \right) \cdot Df(x)^{-1}, \quad (\text{A.18})$$

where  $c_\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$  are universal constants and the index set  $\Delta_\alpha^1$  consists of all

$$\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{|\alpha|}) \in \mathbb{N}^n \times \dots \times \mathbb{N}^n = (\mathbb{N}^n)^{|\alpha|}$$

such that

$$|\gamma_1| + \dots + |\gamma_{|\alpha|}| = |\alpha|.$$

Now statement 1. follows easily from (A.16) and (A.18). To prove 2. in the case when  $V$  is convex notice that

$$\|(Df)^{-1}\|_{C^\mu(U)} \leq \|Df\|_{C^\mu(U)} \|(Df)^{-1}\|_{C^0(U)}^2$$

for any  $0 < \mu < 1$ . Moreover, for any  $h \in C^\mu(U)$  we have

$$\|h \circ g\|_{C^\mu(V)} \leq \|h\|_{C^\mu(U)} \|Dg\|_{C^0(V)}^\mu = \|h\|_{C^\mu(U)} \|(Df)^{-1}\|_{C^0(U)}^\mu$$

since  $V$  is convex. Now the inequality of 2. follows from (A.16) and (A.18) as in the proof of Proposition A.4.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 9.2.* One can take the convolution  $\psi_\varepsilon^U = \psi * \chi_\varepsilon$ , where  $\psi$  is the characteristic function of  $U$ ,  $\chi_\varepsilon(x) = \varepsilon^{-n} \chi(x/\varepsilon)$  and  $\chi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  is a test-function such that  $\chi(x) > 0$  if  $|x| < 1$ ,  $\chi(x) = 0$  if  $|x| \geq 1$  and  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \chi(x) dx = 1$ . More precisely, we first define a smooth function  $\tilde{\chi}$  by  $\tilde{\chi}(x) = \exp(-(1 - |x|^2)^{-1})$  for  $|x| < 1$  and by  $\tilde{\chi}(x) = 0$  for  $|x| \geq 1$  and then we set  $\chi(x) = \tilde{\chi}(x) / \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \tilde{\chi}(x) dx$ . For any  $\ell \geq 0$  we have  $\|\chi_\varepsilon\|_{\ell; \varepsilon} = \varepsilon^{-n} \|\chi\|_\ell$ . Set  $\phi := \psi_1^U$  and  $\phi_\varepsilon(x) = \varepsilon^{-n} \phi(x/\varepsilon)$ , where  $U = B^n(0, 2)$ . Then  $\phi(x) = 1$  for  $|x| \leq 1$ , hence,  $\phi(x/\varepsilon) = 1$  for  $x$  in the support of  $\chi_\varepsilon$  and we easily obtain the inequality

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \chi_\varepsilon(x - y) - \partial_z^\alpha \chi_\varepsilon(z - y)| \leq (\phi((x - y)/\varepsilon) + \phi((z - y)/\varepsilon)) |\partial_x^\alpha \chi_\varepsilon(x - y) - \partial_z^\alpha \chi_\varepsilon(z - y)|$$

for any  $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$ . This implies

$$\|\psi_\varepsilon^U\|_{\ell; \varepsilon} \leq 2\varepsilon^n \|\psi * \phi_\varepsilon\|_{L^1} \|\chi_\varepsilon\|_{\ell; \varepsilon} \leq 2\|\phi_\varepsilon\|_{L^1} \|\chi\|_\ell = 2\|\phi\|_{L^1} \|\chi\|_\ell = C_\ell$$

which prives the Lemma.  $\square$

### A.2.2 Interpolation inequalities.

The above estimates can be simplified considerably if  $D$  is the whole space using certain interpolation inequalities. More precisely, let  $D = \mathbb{R}^m$  and let  $r, s, \ell$  be positive numbers with  $0 \leq r < s < \ell$  and  $\mu := (\ell - s)/(\ell - r)$ . Then there is a constant  $c = c_{r, \ell} > 0$  depending only on  $\ell$  and  $r$  such that for any  $f \in C^\ell(\mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m)$  the following estimate holds (e.g. [60] ...)

$$\|f\|_s \leq c_{r, \ell} \|f\|_r^\mu \|f\|_\ell^{1-\mu}. \quad (\text{A.19})$$

Moreover, given  $f, g \in C^\ell(\mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m)$  one can estimate the  $C^\ell$ -norm of

$$\|fg\|_\ell \leq \|f\|_0 \|g\|_\ell + \|f\|_\ell \|g\|_0. \quad (\text{A.20})$$

**Remark A.6** Let  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^m$  be an open convex set and  $f \in C^\infty(\overline{D})$  or  $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^n \times \overline{D})$ . Then (A.19) still holds for any positive numbers  $r, s, \ell$  with  $0 \leq r < s < \ell$ . Moreover, there exists  $C_\ell$  depending only on  $\ell$  and on the dimensions  $n$  and  $m$  such that if  $f, g \in C^\infty(\overline{D})$  or  $f, g \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^n \times \overline{D})$  then  $\|fg\|_\ell \leq C_\ell(\|f\|_0\|g\|_\ell + \|f\|_\ell\|g\|_0)$ .

*Proof.* To prove the Remark one first applies a suitable Whitney extension theorem. If  $\ell \notin \mathbb{N}$  we use the Whitney extension theorem in  $C^\ell$  given by Stein in [63], Chapter VI, Theorem 4, and if  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  we use Theorem A.15. In order to obtain the second estimate in (A.33) one applies Taylor's formula in the convex set  $\overline{D}$ . Denote by  $\tilde{f}$  and  $\tilde{g}$  the corresponding extensions in  $\mathbb{R}^m$  or in  $\mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$ . Notice that the corresponding constants in the Whitney extension theorem ( $A_N$  in Theorem A.15) depend only on  $\ell$  and on the dimension - if  $f, g \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^n \times \overline{D})$  then  $\|\tilde{f}\|_{C^\ell(\mathbb{R}^m)} \leq C_\ell\|f\|_{C^\ell(D)}$  and  $\|\tilde{g}\|_{C^\ell(\mathbb{R}^m)} \leq C_\ell\|g\|_{C^\ell(D)}$ , where  $C_\ell$  depends only on  $\ell$  and  $m$ . Then combining the interpolation inequalities (A.19) and (A.20) for the extensions  $\tilde{f}$  and  $\tilde{g}$  with the inequalities given above we prove the Remark.  $\square$

In particular, (A.19) holds if  $f \in C^t(\mathbb{T}^n \times D)$  has a compact support. Using the interpolation inequalities as in [36], Proposition 5.5, one obtains

**Proposition A.7** Let  $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{A}_1, \mathbb{A}_2)$  and  $g \in C^\infty(\mathbb{A}_2, \mathbb{R})$ , where  $\mathbb{A}_1 = \mathbb{T}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$ ,  $\mathbb{A}_2 = \mathbb{T}^{n_2} \times D_2$  and  $D_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$  is an open set. Then the following holds

1. For any  $\ell \geq 1$ ,

$$|g \circ f|_{\ell, \mathbb{A}_1} \leq C_\ell(1 + \|df\|_{C^0(\mathbb{A}_1)}^{\ell-1}) \sum_{m=1}^{[\ell]} \left( |g|_{m, \mathbb{A}_2} \|df\|_{C^{\ell-m}(\mathbb{A}_1)} + |g|_{m+\{\ell\}, \mathbb{A}_2} \|df\|_{C^{[\ell]-m}(\mathbb{A}_1)} \right)$$

where  $C_\ell > 0$  depends only on  $\ell \geq 1$  and on the dimensions  $n_j$  and  $d_j$ .

2. Let  $\mathbb{A}_j = \mathbb{T}^{n_j} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_j}$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ . Then

$$|g \circ f|_{\ell, \mathbb{A}_1} \leq C_\ell(1 + \|df\|_{C^0(\mathbb{A}_1)}^{\ell-1}) \left( \|g\|_{\ell, \mathbb{A}_2} \|df\|_{C^0(\mathbb{A}_1)} + \|g\|_{1, \mathbb{A}_2} \|df\|_{C^{\ell-1}(\mathbb{A}_1)} \right), \quad (\text{A.21})$$

where  $C_\ell > 0$  depends only on  $\ell \geq 1$  and on the dimensions  $n_j$  and  $d_j$ .

3. Let  $D_j$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ , be an open convex subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{d_j}$  and  $\overline{\mathbb{A}}_j = \mathbb{T}^{n_j} \times \overline{D}_j$ . Then (A.21) holds for any  $f \in C^\infty(\overline{\mathbb{A}}_1, \overline{\mathbb{A}}_2)$  and  $g \in C^\infty(\overline{\mathbb{A}}_2, \mathbb{R})$  with a constant  $C_\ell$  depending only on  $\ell \geq 1$  and the dimensions  $n_j$  and  $d_j$ .

*Proof.* To prove the first statement we make use of Proposition A.4 and of the interpolation inequalities. Consider a typical term of (A.13) given by

$$A := \sum_{\Delta(\ell, m)} |f|_{k_1+\delta_1} \cdots |f|_{k_m+\delta_m}$$

where  $k_1 + \cdots + k_m = [\ell]$ ,  $\delta_1 + \cdots + \delta_m = \{\ell\}$ , and  $k_j \geq 1$ ,  $\delta_j \geq 0$  for any  $j$ . If  $1 < k_j + \delta_j < \ell - m + 1$  setting  $r = 0$ ,  $s = k_j + \delta_j - 1$  and  $t = \ell - m$ , we get by means of the interpolation inequalities

$$|f|_{k_j+\delta_j} \leq \|df\|_{k_j+\delta_j-1} \leq c_\ell \|df\|_0^{\frac{\ell-m+1-k_j-\delta_j}{\ell-m}} \|df\|_{\ell-m}^{\frac{k_j+\delta_j-1}{\ell-m}}.$$

In this way we obtain

$$A \leq c_\ell \|df\|_0^{m-1} \|df\|_{\ell-m}$$

where  $c_\ell > 0$  depends only on  $\ell$ . This proves 1.

To prove 2 one uses the interpolation inequalities with respect to  $v$  as well. Namely, given  $u, v \in C^\ell$  and  $0 < m < \ell$  one obtains

$$\|u\|_m \|v\|_{\ell-m} \leq c_\ell \|u\|_0^{\frac{\ell-m}{\ell}} \|u\|_\ell^{\frac{m}{\ell}} \|v\|_0^{\frac{m}{\ell}} \|v\|_\ell^{\frac{\ell-m}{\ell}} < c_\ell (\|u\|_\ell \|v\|_0 + \|v\|_\ell \|u\|_0)$$

by means of (A.19) and Young's inequality

$$xy \leq \frac{1}{p}x^p + \frac{1}{q}y^q < x^p + y^q,$$

where  $x$  and  $y$  are non-negative and  $p$  and  $q$  are positive numbers such that  $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$ . The inequality in 2 has been proven for more general domains in ([36], Proposition 5.5) but the constants there depend on the domains. The statement 3 follows from 2 and Remark A.6.  $\square$

In the same way we obtain

**Corollary A.8** *Let  $u \in C^\infty(\overline{\mathbb{A}}_1, \overline{\mathbb{A}}_2)$  be a diffeomorphism with inverse  $v = u^{-1} \in C^\infty(\overline{\mathbb{A}}_2, \overline{\mathbb{A}}_1)$ , where  $\overline{\mathbb{A}}_j = \mathbb{T}^n \times \overline{D}_j$  and  $D_j \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ , are open sets. Then the following holds.*

1. *Let  $D_1$  be convex. Then for any integer  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ ,*

$$\|dv\|_{C^\ell(\mathbb{A}_2)} \leq C_\ell \left(1 + \|(du)^{-1}\|_{C^0(\mathbb{A}_1)}^{\ell+2}\right) \|du\|_{C^\ell(\mathbb{A}_1)} \quad (\text{A.22})$$

*where  $C_\ell$  depends only on  $\ell$  and on the dimensions  $n$  and  $d$ .*

2. *Let both  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  be convex. Then (A.22) holds for any non-negative  $\ell$ .*

*The same holds if  $\mathbb{A}_1 = \mathbb{A}_2 = \mathbb{T}^n$  ( $d = 0$ ) or if  $\mathbb{A}_1 = D_1$  and  $\mathbb{A}_2 = D_2$  ( $n = 0$ ).*

*Proof.* The inequality (A.22) follows from Proposition A.5 and Remark A.6 as in the proof of Proposition A.7.  $\square$

### A.2.3 Weighted Hölder norms and interpolation inequalities.

Given  $0 < \kappa \leq 1$ ,  $\ell \geq 0$ , and  $f \in C^\ell(\mathbb{T}^n \times D)$ , where  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  is an open set we define the corresponding weighted  $C^\ell$  norm by

$$\|f\|_{\ell, \mathbb{T}^n \times D; \kappa} := \|f \circ \sigma_\kappa\|_{\ell, \sigma_\kappa^{-1}(\mathbb{T}^n \times D)}.$$

We set as well  $|f|_{\ell, \mathbb{T}^n \times D; \kappa} := |f \circ \sigma_\kappa|_{\ell, \sigma_\kappa^{-1}(\mathbb{T}^n \times D)}$ . In particular, if  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $\|f\|_{m, \mathbb{T}^n \times D; \kappa} = \sup_{0 \leq m \leq \ell} |f|_{m, \mathbb{T}^n \times D; \kappa}$ , where

$$|f|_{m, \mathbb{T}^n \times D; \kappa} := \sup_{|\alpha|+|\beta|=m} \|\partial_\theta^\alpha (\kappa \partial_r)^\beta f\|_{C^0(\mathbb{T}^n \times D)}.$$

Applying (A.19) to  $f = u \circ \sigma_\kappa$  with  $0 < \kappa \leq 1$  one gets the interpolating inequalities for  $\|u\|_{t;\kappa} := \|u\|_{t,\mathbb{A};\kappa}$ , where  $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d$ .

We list below several estimates which follow directly from Proposition A.7. Set

$$\|u\|_{\ell,D;\kappa} = \sup_{0 \leq m \leq \ell} \|u\|_{\ell-m,D;\kappa},$$

where  $m$  are integers.

**Proposition A.9** *Fix  $0 < \kappa \leq 1$ .*

1. *Let  $u \in C^\infty(\mathbb{A}_1, \mathbb{A}_2)$  and  $v \in C^\infty(\mathbb{A}_2, \mathbb{R})$ , where  $\mathbb{A}_1 = \mathbb{T}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$ ,  $\mathbb{A}_2 = \mathbb{T}^{n_2} \times D_2$  and  $D_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$  is an open set. Then for any  $\ell \geq 1$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} |v \circ u|_{\ell, \mathbb{A}_1; \kappa} &\leq C_{[\ell]} \left( 1 + \|d(\sigma_\kappa^{-1} \circ u \circ \sigma_\kappa)\|_{C^0}^{\ell-1} \right) \\ &\times \sum_{m=1}^{[\ell]} \left( \|v\|_{m, \mathbb{A}_2; \kappa} \|d(\sigma_\kappa^{-1} \circ u \circ \sigma_\kappa)\|_{C^{\ell-m}(\mathbb{A}_1)} + \|v\|_{m+\{\ell\}, \mathbb{A}_2; \kappa} \|d(\sigma_\kappa^{-1} \circ u \circ \sigma_\kappa)\|_{C^{[\ell]-m}(\mathbb{A}_1)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where  $C_\ell > 0$  depends only on  $\ell$  and on the dimensions  $n_j$  and  $d_j$ .

2. *Let  $\mathbb{A}_1 = \mathbb{T}^{n_2} \times D_1$ , where  $D_1$  is an open convex subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{d_1}$ ,  $\mathbb{A}_2 = \mathbb{T}^{n_2} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$ , and  $u \in C^\infty(\overline{\mathbb{A}_1}, \mathbb{A}_2)$ . Then*

$$\begin{aligned} |v \circ u|_{\ell, \mathbb{A}_1; \kappa} &\leq C_\ell \left( 1 + \|d(\sigma_\kappa^{-1} \circ u \circ \sigma_\kappa)\|_{C^0}^{\ell-1} \right) \\ &\times (\|v\|_{\ell; \kappa} \|d(\sigma_\kappa^{-1} \circ u \circ \sigma_\kappa)\|_{C^0} + \|v\|_{1; \kappa} \|d(\sigma_\kappa^{-1} \circ u \circ \sigma_\kappa)\|_{C^{\ell-1}}) \end{aligned}$$

for any  $\ell \geq 1$ , where  $C_\ell > 0$  depends only on  $\ell$  and on the dimensions  $n_j$  and  $d_j$ . In particular, if  $\mathbb{A}_2 = \mathbb{T}^{n_2}$  ( $d_2 = 0$ ) then

$$\|v \circ u\|_{\ell; \kappa} \leq \|v \circ u\|_{C^0} + C_\ell \left( 1 + \|u\|_{1; \kappa}^{\ell-1} \right) (\|v\|_{\ell; \kappa} \|u\|_{1; \kappa} + \|v\|_{1; \kappa} \|u\|_{\ell; \kappa}).$$

3. *Let  $D_j \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_j}$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ , be open sets in  $\mathbb{R}^{d_j}$  and let  $D_1$  be convex. Then for any  $u \in C^\infty(\overline{D_1}, \mathbb{R}^{d_2})$  with  $u(D_1) \subset D_2$  and  $v \in C^\infty(\mathbb{A}_2)$  with  $\mathbb{A}_2 = \mathbb{T}^{n_2} \times D_2$  we have*

$$\begin{aligned} |v \circ u|_{\ell, D_1; \kappa} &\leq C_\ell \left( 1 + \|du\|_{C^0(D_1)}^{\ell-1} \right) \\ &\times \sum_{m=1}^{[\ell]} (|v|_{m, \mathbb{A}_2; \kappa} (1 + \|du\|_{\ell-m, D_1; \kappa}) + |v|_{m+\{\ell\}, \mathbb{A}_2; \kappa} (1 + \|du\|_{[\ell]-m, D_1; \kappa})) \\ &\leq C_\ell \left( 1 + \|du\|_{C^0(D_1)}^{\ell-1} \right) (1 + \|du\|_{C^\ell(D_1)}) \|v\|_{\ell, \mathbb{A}_2; \kappa} \end{aligned}$$

for any  $\ell \geq 1$ , where the constant  $C_{[\ell]} > 0$  depends only on  $[\ell]$  and on the dimensions  $d_j$  and  $n_2$ .

*Proof.* To prove 1 we set  $f = \sigma_\kappa^{-1} \circ u \circ \sigma_\kappa$  and  $g = v \circ \sigma_\kappa$  in Proposition A.7. The statement 2 follows from Proposition A.7, 3. To prove 3 we use Proposition A.4, 3, and apply Remark A.6 to  $u \in C^\infty(\overline{D_1})$  using the interpolation inequalities for the extension of  $u$  as in the proof of Proposition A.7. To prove the second inequality in 3 notice that  $\|du\|_{\mu, D_1; \kappa} \leq \|du\|_{\ell, D_1; \kappa}$  for  $\mu \leq \ell$  since  $D_1$  is convex.  $\square$

**Remark A.10** *The estimates in Proposition A.9 hold when  $\kappa = (\kappa', \kappa'')$  with  $0 < \kappa', \kappa'' \leq 1$ ,  $D_j = D'_j \times D''_j$ ,  $\sigma_\kappa(\theta, x', x'') = (\theta, \kappa' x', \kappa'' x'')$  and  $|u|_{\ell, \mathbb{A}_1; \kappa} := |u \circ \sigma_\kappa|_{C^\ell(\sigma_\kappa^{-1}(\mathbb{A}_1))}$ .*

Given  $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$  we set  $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d$ . Using the interpolation inequalities and Proposition A.5 we obtain

**Proposition A.11** *Let  $u = \text{id} + \phi$ , where  $\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{A})$  and*

$$(n + d)\|\phi\|_{C^1} \leq \varepsilon_0 < 1.$$

*Then  $u$  is a diffeomorphism with inverse  $u^{-1} = \text{id} + \psi$ , where  $\psi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{A})$  and for any  $\ell \geq 0$  we have*

$$\|\psi\|_{C^\ell} \leq C_\ell \|\phi\|_{C^\ell}$$

*where  $C_\ell = C_\ell(\varepsilon_0, n, d) > 0$  depends only on  $\ell$ ,  $\varepsilon_0$ , and on the dimensions  $n$  and  $d$ . If  $\text{supp } \phi \subset \mathbb{T}^n \times K$  then  $\text{supp } \psi \subset \mathbb{T}^n \times K$  as well. Moreover, if the map  $[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow \phi_t \in C^\infty(\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{A})$  is  $C^k$  then so is the map  $t \rightarrow \psi_t$ . The same holds if  $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{T}^n$  ( $d = 0$ ) or  $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{R}^d$  ( $n = 0$ ).*

*Proof.* Notice that  $\|d\phi\|_{C^0} < (n + d)\|\phi\|_{C^1} \leq \varepsilon_0 < 1$ . The inverse function theorem implies that  $u$  is a diffeomorphism with inverse  $u^{-1} = \text{id} + \psi$ , where  $\psi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{A})$ . The estimate of  $\psi$  in the  $C^\ell$  norms with  $\ell \geq 1$  follow from Proposition A.5 and the interpolation inequalities as in the proof of Proposition A.7. Consider now the case when  $0 \leq \ell < 1$ . We have  $\psi = -\phi \circ u^{-1}$ , where  $u^{-1}$  is a diffeomorphism on  $\mathbb{A}$  which implies  $\|\psi\|_{C^0} = \|\phi\|_{C^0}$ . Moreover, for any  $0 < \ell < 1$  and  $x \neq y$  setting  $\xi = u^{-1}(x)$  and  $\eta = u^{-1}(y)$  one obtains

$$\frac{\|\psi(y) - \psi(x)\|}{\|y - x\|^\ell} \leq \|\phi\|_{C^\ell} \|(du)^{-1}\|_{C^0}^\ell \leq C(1 - \varepsilon_0)^{-1} \|\phi\|_{C^\ell}.$$

To prove the assertion about the support notice that  $u^{-1} = \text{id}$  on  $\mathbb{T}^n \times (\mathbb{R}^d \setminus K)$ . □

#### A.2.4 Symplectic transformations and generating functions.

Consider a  $C^1$  family of exact symplectic maps  $W_t : \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ ,  $t \in [0, \delta]$ , where  $\mathbb{A} := \mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ . Suppose that  $W_t - \text{id}$  is compactly supported for any  $t$ . We are looking for a  $C^1$  family of generating functions

$$\tilde{G}_t(\varphi, r) = \langle \varphi, r \rangle - G_t(\varphi, r), \quad (\varphi, r) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (\text{A.23})$$

of  $W_t$  such that the function  $G_t$  is 1-periodic with respect to  $\varphi$ , compactly supported with respect to  $r$  and

$$W_t \left( \nabla_r \tilde{G}_t(\varphi, r), r \right) = \left( \varphi, \nabla_\varphi \tilde{G}_t(\varphi, r) \right), \quad (\varphi, r) \in \mathbb{A}. \quad (\text{A.24})$$

Given a smooth function  $G$  in  $\mathbb{A} := \mathbb{T}^d \times D$ , we denote by

$$\text{sgrad } G(\theta, r) := (\nabla_r G(\theta, r), -\nabla_\theta G(\theta, r))$$

its symplectic gradient. Notice that  $\|\sigma_\kappa^{-1} \text{sgrad } G_t\|_{\ell, \mathbb{A}; \kappa} \leq \kappa^{-1} \|G_t\|_{\ell+1, \mathbb{A}; \kappa}$ .

**Lemma A.12** *Let  $[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow W_t : \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$  be a  $C^1$  family of exact symplectic mappings. Suppose that*

$$\|\sigma_\kappa^{-1}(W_t - \text{id})\|_{1, \mathbb{A}; \kappa} \leq \varepsilon_0/d < 1/d \quad (\text{A.25})$$

*for  $t \in [0, \delta]$ . Then there exists a  $C^1$  family of generating functions  $\tilde{G}_t$  of  $W_t$  given by (A.23) such that for any  $\ell \geq 0$  the following estimate hold true*

$$\|\sigma_\kappa^{-1} \text{sgrad } G_t\|_{\ell, \mathbb{A}; \kappa} \leq C_\ell \|\sigma_\kappa^{-1} W_t\|_{\ell, \mathbb{A}; \kappa} \quad (\text{A.26})$$

*for  $t \in [0, \delta]$ , where  $C_\ell = C_\ell(\varepsilon_0, d) > 0$  depends only on  $\ell$ ,  $\varepsilon_0$  and  $d$ . Moreover, the relation  $\text{supp}(W_t - \text{id}) \subset \mathbb{T}^d \times K$  implies  $\text{supp}(\text{sgrad } G_t) \subset \mathbb{T}^d \times K$  as well.*

*Conversely, let  $G_t$  be a  $C^1$  family of functions such that*

$$\|\sigma_\kappa^{-1} \text{sgrad } G_t\|_{1, \mathbb{A}; \kappa} \leq \varepsilon_0/d < 1/d \quad (\text{A.27})$$

*for  $t \in [0, \delta]$ . Then  $\tilde{G}_t$  given by (A.23) is a  $C^1$  family of generating functions of symplectic maps  $W_t : \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$  and for any  $\ell \geq 0$*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\sigma_\kappa^{-1}(W_t - \text{id})\|_{\ell, \mathbb{A}; \kappa} + \|\sigma_\kappa^{-1}(W_t^{-1} - \text{id})\|_{\ell, \mathbb{A}; \kappa} \\ & \leq C_\ell \|\sigma_\kappa^{-1} \text{sgrad } G_t\|_{\ell, \mathbb{A}; \kappa} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.28})$$

*where  $t \in [0, \delta]$  and  $C_\ell = C_\ell(\varepsilon_0, d) > 0$  depends only on  $\ell$ ,  $\varepsilon_0$  and  $d$ . Moreover, if  $\text{supp}(\text{sgrad } G_t) \subset \mathbb{T}^d \times K$  then  $\text{supp}(W_t - \text{id}) \subset \mathbb{T}^d \times K$  as well.*

*Proof.* Set  $W_t = (U_t, V_t) : \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ . It follows from (A.25) that the function  $\theta \rightarrow U_t(\theta, r) - \theta$  is 1-periodic. Consider the map  $f_t = \text{id} - g_t : \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ , where  $g_t(\theta, r) = (U_t(\theta, r) - \theta, 0)$ . Then using (A.25) one obtains

$$\|dg_t\|_{C^0(\mathbb{A})} < d \|\sigma_\kappa^{-1}(W_t - \text{id})\|_{1, \mathbb{A}; \kappa} \leq \varepsilon_0 < 1$$

for any  $t \in [0, \delta]$ . The implicit function theorem implies that  $f_t$  is a diffeomorphism of  $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$  to itself homotope to the identity. In particular, the equation  $\varphi = U_t(\theta, r)$  has a unique smooth solution  $\theta = \varphi - \phi_t(\varphi, r)$ , where  $\phi_t$  is 1-periodic with respect to  $\varphi$  and the map  $[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow \phi_t \in C^\infty(\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{A})$  is  $C^1$ . Proposition A.9, 2., yields

$$\|\phi_t\|_{\ell; \kappa} \leq C_\ell \|\sigma_\kappa^{-1}(W_t - \text{id})\|_{\ell, \mathbb{A}; \kappa} \quad (\text{A.29})$$

where  $C_\ell > 0$  depends only on  $\ell$ ,  $\varepsilon_0$  and  $d$ . On the other hand, the map  $W_t$  is exact symplectic and close to the identity and there exists a  $C^1$ -family of generating functions  $\tilde{G}_t$  such that  $G_t$  is compactly supported and

$$\nabla_r G_t(\varphi, r) = \phi_t(\varphi, r), \quad \nabla_\varphi G_t(\varphi, r) = V_t(\varphi - \phi_t(\varphi, r), r) - r.$$

We are going to prove (A.27). The estimate of  $\nabla_r G_t$  follows from (A.29). To prove the estimate of  $\kappa^{-1} \nabla_\varphi G_t$  we write

$$\nabla_\varphi G_t(\varphi, r) = (V_t(\varphi, r), r) - r + \int_0^1 d_\theta V_t(\varphi - s\phi_t(\varphi, r), r) \phi_t(\varphi, r) ds,$$

where  $d_\theta$  is the partial differential with respect to the first variables  $\theta$ . Notice that  $\|\phi_t\|_{1; \kappa} \leq C_1 \varepsilon_0$  in view of (A.25) and (A.29). Then using (A.20), Proposition A.9, 2, and (A.25) we complete

the proof of (A.27). Suppose now that  $\text{supp}(W_t - \text{id}) \subset \mathbb{T}^d \times K$ . Then  $\text{supp}(f_t - \text{id}) \subset \mathbb{T}^d \times K$  which implies that  $\text{supp}(f_t^{-1} - \text{id}) \subset \mathbb{T}^d \times K$ . Hence,  $\phi_t(\varphi, r) = 0$  for  $\varphi \in \mathbb{T}^n$  and  $r \notin K$  and  $\text{supp}(\text{sgrad } G_t) \subset \mathbb{T}^d \times K$ .

In the same way we prove the second part of the Lemma. Suppose that (A.27) holds. Using the implicit function theorem one solves as above the equation

$$\theta = \varphi - \nabla_r G_t(\varphi, r)$$

with respect to  $\varphi \in \mathbb{T}^d$ . The corresponding solution has the form

$$\varphi = \theta + \psi_t(\theta, r).$$

Moreover, Proposition A.9 implies

$$\|\psi_t\|_{\ell, \mathbb{A}; \kappa} \leq C_\ell \|\sigma_\kappa^{-1} \text{sgrad } G_t\|_{\ell, \mathbb{A}; \kappa} \quad (\text{A.30})$$

for any  $t \in [0, \delta]$ , where  $\ell \geq 0$  and  $C_\ell > 0$  depends only on  $\ell$ ,  $\varepsilon_0$  and  $n$ . Then using (A.24) and Proposition A.9 we estimate of  $W_t - \text{id}$ . We get the same estimates for  $(W_t)^{-1} - \text{id}$ , where

$$(W_t)^{-1}(\varphi, r - \nabla_\varphi G_t(\varphi, r)) = (\varphi - \nabla_r G_t(\varphi, r), r).$$

To this end we first solve the equation  $r - \nabla_\varphi G_t(\varphi, r) = I$  with respect to  $r$  and then we proceed as above.  $\square$

The estimates (A.26) and (A.28) are still valid if we add additional parameters  $s \in \mathbb{T}^p$  and  $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^q$ . Set  $\mathbb{A} := \mathbb{A}_1 \times \mathbb{A}_2$ , where  $\mathbb{A}_1 = \mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\mathbb{A}_2 = \mathbb{T}^p \times \mathbb{R}^q$ . Given  $\kappa = (\kappa_1, \kappa_2)$  with  $0 < \kappa_1, \kappa_2 \leq 1$  and  $f \in C^\ell(\mathbb{A}_1 \times \mathbb{A}_2)$  we set  $\|f\|_{\ell, \mathbb{A}; \kappa} = \|f \circ \sigma_\kappa\|_{C^\ell(\mathbb{A})}$ , where  $\sigma_\kappa(\theta, r, s, \omega) = (\theta, \kappa_1 r, s, \kappa_2 \omega)$ .

**Remark A.13** Suppose that the map  $[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow G_t \in C^\infty(\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{R})$  is  $C^1$  and

$$\|\sigma_{\kappa_1}^{-1}(\text{sgrad } G_t(\cdot, s, \omega) - \text{id}_{\mathbb{A}_1}(\cdot))\|_{1, \mathbb{A}_1; \kappa_1} \leq \varepsilon_0/d < 1/d,$$

for  $t \in [0, \delta]$  and  $(s, \omega) \in \mathbb{A}_2$ , where  $\text{id}_{\mathbb{A}_1}$  is the identity map on  $\mathbb{A}_1$ . Then for any  $(s, \omega) \in \mathbb{A}_2$  fixed, the function  $(\theta, r) \rightarrow \tilde{G}_t(\theta, r, s, \omega) = \langle \theta, r \rangle - G_t(\theta, r, s, \omega)$  is a generating function of an exact symplectic map  $W_t(\cdot, s, \omega)$  in  $\mathbb{A}_1$ , the map  $[0, \delta] \ni t \rightarrow W_t \in C^\infty(\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{A}_1)$  is  $C^1$  and

$$\|\sigma_{\kappa_1}^{-1}(W_t - \text{id}_{\mathbb{A}_1})\|_{\ell, \mathbb{A}; \kappa} + \|\sigma_{\kappa_1}^{-1}(W_t^{-1} - \text{id}_{\mathbb{A}_1})\|_{\ell, \mathbb{A}; \kappa} \leq C_\ell \|\sigma_{\kappa_1}^{-1} \text{sgrad } G_t\|_{\ell, \mathbb{A}; \kappa} \quad (\text{A.31})$$

where  $W_t^{-1}(\cdot, s, \omega)$  is the inverse of  $W_t(\cdot, s, \omega)$  in  $\mathbb{A}_1$  with  $(s, \omega) \in \mathbb{A}_2$  fixed and  $C_\ell > 0$  depends only on  $\ell$ ,  $\varepsilon_0$  and on the dimensions  $d, p$  and  $q$ .

Let  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be an open set and  $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{T}^d \times D$ . Consider a function  $\tilde{G} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{A})$  of the form

$$\tilde{G}(\theta, r) = \langle \theta, r \rangle - K(r) - G(\theta, r),$$

Recall that the map  $Q$  defined by  $Q(\theta, r) = (\theta + \nabla K(r), r)$  is a symplectic map with generating function  $(\theta, r) \rightarrow \langle \theta, r \rangle - K(r)$ .

**Lemma A.14** *Let  $\text{supp } G \subset \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times K$ , where  $K \subset D$  is a compact and let  $G$  satisfy (A.27). Then the function  $(\theta, r) \mapsto \langle \theta, r \rangle - G(\theta, r)$  is a generating functions of a symplectic transformation  $W : \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ ,  $G$  is a generating functions of a symplectic transformations  $P : \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ , the support of  $W - \text{id}$  is contained in  $\mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times K$  and  $P = W \circ Q$ .*

*Proof.* The assertions about  $W$  follow from Lemma A.12. As in the proof of Lemma A.12 one obtains that the map  $\theta \mapsto \theta - \nabla_r G(\theta, r)$  is a diffeomorphism of  $\mathbb{T}^d$  homothope to the identity mapping. Then comparing the identities

$$P(\theta - \nabla_r K(r) - \nabla_r G(\theta, r), r) = (\theta, r - \nabla_\theta G(\theta, r))$$

and

$$(W \circ Q)(\theta - \nabla_r K(r) - \nabla_r G(\theta, r), r) = W(\theta - \nabla_r G(\theta, r), r) = (\theta, r - \nabla_\theta G(\theta, r))$$

we obtain the relation  $P = W \circ Q$ .  $\square$

### A.3 Whitney Extension Theorem

We shall give a variant of the Whitney extension theorem suitable to our setting.

Given a closed subset  $X$  of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , we consider a jet  $\mathcal{F} := (f^\beta)_{\beta \in \mathbb{N}^d}$  of functions  $f^\beta : [0, a] \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , such that for any  $0 \leq j \leq k$  and  $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^d$  the partial derivative  $\partial_t^j f^\beta$  exists and is continuous on  $[0, a] \times X$ . For every  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $x, y \in X$  we set

$$\begin{cases} (T_x^N \mathcal{F})_\beta(t, y) := \sum_{|\beta + \gamma| \leq N} (y - x)^\gamma f^{\beta + \gamma}(t, x) / \gamma! \\ (R_x^N \mathcal{F})_\beta(t, y) := f^\beta(t, y) - (T_x^N \mathcal{F})_\beta(t, y), \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.32})$$

where  $(T_x^N \mathcal{F})_\beta(t, \cdot)$  stands for the ‘‘Taylor polynomial’’ of the function  $y \mapsto f^\beta(t, y)$  at  $y = x$  of order  $N - |\beta|$ . We say that  $\mathcal{F}$  is a  $C^k$ -family (with respect to  $t \in [0, a]$ ) of  $C^\infty$ -Whitney jets on  $X$  if for any  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  there is a positive constant  $C_N$  such that

$$\begin{cases} |\partial_t^p f^\beta(t, x)| \leq C_N \quad \text{for } |\beta| \leq M \\ |\partial_t^p (R_x^q \mathcal{F})_\gamma(y)| |y - x|^{-(q+1+|\gamma|)} \leq C_N \quad \text{for } q + |\gamma| \leq M - 1 \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.33})$$

and for each  $t \in [0, a]$ ,  $x, y$  in  $X$  and all indices  $0 \leq p \leq k$ . The space of Whitney jets equipped by the inductive topology corresponding to the family of norms  $\|\mathcal{F}\|_{C^{k,N}([0,a] \times X)} := \inf C_N$ , with  $C_N$  given by (A.33), will be denoted by  $C^k([0, a], C^\infty(X))$ . If  $X$  is the closure of an open convex subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and  $f$  is smooth then  $f^\beta = \partial^\beta f$  and  $(T_\omega^N \mathcal{F})_\beta$  is just the corresponding Taylor polynomial of  $\partial^\beta f$  while the second inequality in (A.33) gives an estimate the reminder term in the Taylor formula.

**Theorem A.15** *For any  $k$  and  $N$  in  $\mathbb{N}$  there exists a positive number  $A_N$  depending only on  $k$  and  $N$  and on the dimension  $d$  such that the following holds. For any closed set  $X \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  and*

any jet  $\mathcal{F} = (f^\beta)_{\beta \in \mathbb{N}^d} \in C^k([0, a], C^\infty(X))$  satisfying (A.33) there exists  $\tilde{f} \in C^k([0, a]; C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$  such that  $\partial_t^p \partial_x^\beta \tilde{f} = \partial_t^p f^\beta$  on  $[0, a] \times X$  for each  $0 \leq p \leq k$  and  $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^d$ , and

$$\forall N \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \|\tilde{f}\|_{C^{p,N}([0,a] \times \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq A_N \|f\|_{C^{p,N}([0,a] \times X)}. \quad (\text{A.34})$$

Moreover, if  $X = \mathbb{R}^{d_1} \times \Sigma$ , where  $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$  is closed and if  $f^\beta$  is 1-periodic with respect to the first  $d_1$  variables then so is  $\tilde{f}$ .

In the case when  $X = \mathbb{R}^{d_1} \times \Sigma$  we identify the space of jets which are 1-periodic with respect to the first  $d_1$  variables with  $C^k([0, a]; C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^{d_1} \times \Sigma))$ .

To prove the theorem we first consider the case when  $X$  is a single point in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  (then  $R_x^N = 0$  and the second condition of (A.33) is automatically satisfied). Following the proof of the Borel extension theorem we find a family (with respect to  $x \in X$ ) of extension operators

$$\mathcal{E}_x : C^k([0, a], C^\infty(\{x\})) \rightarrow C^k([0, a], C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)), \quad x \in X,$$

such that

$$\|\mathcal{E}_x f\|_{C^{p,N}([0,a] \times \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq A_{N,k} \|f\|_{C^{p,N}([0,a] \times \{x\})}$$

for  $0 \leq p \leq k$ , where  $A_{N,k}$  depends only on  $N$ ,  $k$  and  $d$ , and then we follow the standard proof of the Whitney extension theorem.

*Proof of Proposition 7.1.* We follow the standard proof of the Borel's theorem (see [72], Theorem 4.15 and [38], Proposition 2.3.2). To simplify the notations set  $z = (x, \xi) \in T^*\mathbb{R}^d$ . Consider the increasing sequence  $(\eta_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  where

$$\eta_j := 1 + \sup_{0 \leq k \leq 1} \sup_{|\alpha| \leq j} \sup_{m \leq j} \sup_{(t,z) \in I \times T^*\mathbb{R}^d} |\partial_t^k \partial_z^\alpha a_{t,m}(z)|.$$

Choose  $\chi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  such that  $\chi = 1$  on  $(-\infty, 1/2]$ ,  $0 < \chi < 1$  on  $(1/2, 1)$ , and  $\chi = 0$  on the interval  $[1, +\infty)$  and set

$$a_t(z, \lambda) = \sum_{j \geq 0} \chi\left(\frac{\eta_j}{|\lambda|}\right) a_{t,j}(z) \lambda^{-j}$$

where  $\lambda \in \mathcal{D}$ . Notice the the sum is finite for any  $\lambda \in \mathcal{D}$  fixed. Moreover,  $\frac{\eta_j}{|\lambda|} \chi\left(\frac{\eta_j}{|\lambda|}\right) \leq 1$ , hence, for any  $k \in \{0, 1\}$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{2d}$  with  $|\alpha| \leq j$  we have

$$\chi\left(\frac{\eta_j}{|\lambda|}\right) |\partial_t^k \partial_z^\alpha a_{t,j}(z)| < \chi\left(\frac{\eta_j}{|\lambda|}\right) \eta_j \leq |\lambda|. \quad (\text{A.35})$$

On the other hand  $|\lambda| \leq 2\eta_j$  whenever  $\chi\left(\frac{\eta_j}{|\lambda|}\right) < 1$ , hence,

$$\left(1 - \chi\left(\frac{\eta_j}{|\lambda|}\right)\right) |\partial_t^k \partial_z^\alpha a_{t,j}(z)| \leq C_{p,j,\alpha} |\lambda|^{-p} \quad (\text{A.36})$$

for any  $p \in \mathbb{N}$ . For any  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \partial_t^k \partial_x^\alpha \left( a_t(z, \lambda) - \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} a_{t,j}(z) \lambda^{-j} \right) \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \left( 1 - \chi\left(\frac{\eta_j}{|\lambda|}\right) \right) |\partial_t^k \partial_x^\alpha a_{t,j}(z)| |\lambda|^{-j} + \sum_{j \geq N} \chi\left(\frac{\eta_j}{|\lambda|}\right) |\partial_t^k \partial_x^\alpha a_{t,j}(z)| |\lambda|^{-j}. \end{aligned}$$

Using (A.36) we estimate the first sum by  $C_{N,\alpha}|\lambda|^{-N}$ . If  $N \geq |\alpha|$  taking into account (A.35) we estimate the second sum by  $\eta_N|\lambda|^{-N} + \sum_{j \geq N+1} |\lambda|^{-j+1} \leq C_{N,\alpha}|\lambda|^{-N}$  for  $|\lambda| \geq 2$ . Finally, if  $N < |\alpha|$  we estimate the first  $|\alpha| - N$  terms of the second sum by  $C_{N,\alpha}|\lambda|^{-N}$  and for the other terms we apply the preceding argument. This proves (7.63). The proof shows as well that for any  $k \in \{0, 1\}$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{2d}$  the function  $(t, z) \rightarrow \partial_t^k \partial_x^\alpha a_t(z, \lambda)$  is a sum of a normally convergent series of functions, hence, it is a continuous for any  $\lambda$  fixed. Thus the map  $J \ni t \rightarrow a_t$  is a  $C^1$  family of symbols of order zero.  $\square$

## B Appendix.

### B.1 Invariant characterization of Liouville billiards

Here we prove the following invariant characterization of Liouville billiard tables defined in [53, Sec. 2].

**Theorem 5** *Let  $(X, g)$  be a smooth oriented compact and connected Riemannian manifold of dimension two with connected boundary  $\Gamma \equiv \partial X$ . Assume that*

- (a) *There exists a smooth quadratic in velocities integral of the geodesic flow  $I : TX \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that is invariant with respect to the reflection at the boundary  $TM|_\Gamma \rightarrow TM|_\Gamma$ ,  $\xi \mapsto \xi - 2g(\nu, \xi)$ , where  $\nu$  is the outward unit normal to  $\Gamma$ . In addition, we assume that the metric  $g$  does not allow global Killing symmetries;*
- (b) *There is no point  $x_0 \in \Gamma$  and a constant  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $g_{x_0}(\xi, \xi) = cI_{x_0}(\xi, \xi)$  for any  $\xi \in T_{x_0}X$ .*

*Then  $(X, g)$  is isometric to a Liouville billiard table.<sup>1</sup> Conversely, any Liouville billiard table satisfies the properties stated above.*

**Remark B.1** *The assumption that  $g$  does not allow global Killing symmetries is needed for excluding the case when  $(X, g)$  is a surface of revolution. Condition (b) can be replaced by a similar condition but can not be avoided. One can easily see this by considering the billiard table on the surface of the ellipsoid  $\{\frac{x^2}{a^2} + \frac{y^2}{b^2} + \frac{z^2}{c^2} = 1\}$ ,  $0 < a < b < c$ , defined by the condition  $y \geq 0$ . This billiard table is completely integrable but it is not a Liouville billiard table. Its boundary is the geodesic that corresponds to the intersection of the coordinate plane  $O_{xz}$  with the ellipsoid. In particular, this curve is not locally geodesically convex and it contains the four umbilics of the ellipsoid. One can easily see that the billiard table defined this way satisfies all conditions of Theorem 5 except (b). Condition (b) is also needed to ensure that the integral is non-trivial, i.e.  $I \not\equiv cg$  where  $c$  is a real constant.*

As a consequence of Theorem 5 we see that there exists a double covering map with two branched points,

$$\tau : C \rightarrow X,$$

---

<sup>1</sup>In particular,  $X$  is diffeomorphic to the unit disk  $\mathbb{D}^2$  in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ .

where  $C$  denotes the cylinder  $(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}) \times [-N, N]$ ,  $N > 0$ , coordinatized by the variables  $x$  and  $y$  respectively, so that the metric  $\tau^*(g)$  and the integral  $\tau^*(I)$  have the following form on  $C$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} dg^2 &= (f(x) - q(y))(dx^2 + dy^2) \\ dI^2 &= \alpha dF^2 + \beta dg^2 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.37})$$

where  $\alpha \neq 0$  and  $\beta$  are real constants and

$$dF^2 := (f(x) - q(y))(q(y) dx^2 + f(x) dy^2). \quad (\text{A.38})$$

In other words, the integral  $dI^2$  belongs to the pencil of  $dg^2$  and  $dF^2$ . Here  $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  is 1-periodic,  $q \in C^\infty([-N, N])$ , and

- (i)  $f$  is even,  $f > 0$  if  $x \notin \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ , and  $f(0) = f(1/2) = 0$ ;
- (ii)  $q$  is even,  $q < 0$  if  $y \neq 0$ ,  $q(0) = 0$  and  $q''(0) < 0$ ;
- (iii)  $f^{(2k)}(l/2) = (-1)^k q^{(2k)}(0)$ ,  $l = 0, 1$ , for every natural  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

In particular, if  $f \sim \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} f_k x^{2k}$  is the Taylor expansion of  $f$  at 0, then, by (iii), the Taylor expansion of  $q$  at 0 is  $q \sim \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (-1)^k f_k x^{2k}$ .

**Remark B.2** *The branched points of the covering correspond to the points  $(0, 0)$  and  $(1/2, 0)$  of the cylinder  $C$ . The metric (A.37) and the integral (A.38) on  $C$  vanish at these points.*

*Proof of Theorem 5.* Consider a tubular neighborhood  $V \equiv V(\Gamma) \subseteq X$  of the boundary  $\Gamma$  in  $X$  that is diffeomorphic to the strip  $(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}) \times [-\epsilon, 0]$ ,  $\epsilon > 0$ , and assume that the boundary  $\Gamma$  corresponds to the circle  $(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}) \times \{0\}$ . By gluing two 2-dimensional closed disks along the boundaries of this strip and then by extending the Riemannian metric  $g$  to a smooth Riemannian metric  $g$  on the corresponding 2-sphere, we obtain an isometrical embedding of our tubular neighborhood  $V$  of the boundary  $\Gamma$  into a Riemannian manifold diffeomorphic to the unit 2-sphere  $\mathbb{S}^2$  in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Using the metric  $g$  on  $\mathbb{S}^2$  and passing to isothermal charts we obtain a complex atlas on  $\mathbb{S}^2$ , that transforms  $\mathbb{S}^2$  into a Riemann surface. Then, by the Riemann mapping theorem, this Riemann surface is biholomorphically equivalent to the standard Riemann sphere that we identify with the complex projective plane  $\mathbb{CP}^1$ . Taking a point  $N$  on  $\mathbb{CP}^1$  that does not lie in the image of the strip  $V$  and then applying stereographic projection  $\mathbb{CP}^1 \setminus \{N\} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  we obtain an embedding of the strip  $V$  into the complex plane. By construction, the push-forward of the metric  $g$  is conformally equivalent to the Euclidean metric on  $\mathbb{C}$ . Let  $\{(x, y)\}$  and  $z = x + iy$  be the coordinates in  $\mathbb{C}$ . For simplicity, we will identify the metric  $g$ , the integral  $I$ , and the neighborhood  $V$  and  $\Gamma$  with their corresponding push-forward images. Then we have,

$$dg^2 = \frac{1}{2} \lambda(x, y) (dx^2 + dy^2)$$

and  $V$  is a closed domain in  $\mathbb{C}$  diffeomorphic to the annulus  $(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}) \times [-\epsilon, 0]$ . By construction,  $g$  is extended to a smooth Riemannian metric  $d\tilde{g}^2 = \frac{\lambda(x, y)}{2} (dx^2 + dy^2)$  on the whole of  $\mathbb{C}$ . Let  $\{(p_1, p_2, x, y)\}$  be the standard coordinates on  $T^*\mathbb{R}^2$  where  $\mathbb{R}^2$  is identified with  $\mathbb{C}$ . Applying the Legendre transform, then passing to complex notations and introducing the complex impulses

$p := \frac{1}{2}(p_1 - ip_2)$ ,  $\bar{p} := \frac{1}{2}(p_1 + ip_2)$ , and  $\partial_p := \partial_{p_1} + i\partial_{p_2}$ ,  $\partial_{\bar{p}} := \partial_{p_1} - i\partial_{p_2}$ , we obtain complex coordinates  $\{(p, z)\}$  on  $T^*\mathbb{R}^2$  so that

$$H = \frac{2p\bar{p}}{\lambda(z, \bar{z})} \quad (\text{A.39})$$

and

$$I = A(z, \bar{z})p^2 + B(z, \bar{z})p\bar{p} + \overline{A(z, \bar{z})}\bar{p}^2 \quad (\text{A.40})$$

with  $\overline{B(z, \bar{z})} = B(z, \bar{z})$ .<sup>2</sup> In view of condition (b) of the theorem, the coefficient  $A(z, \bar{z})$  does *not* vanish on  $\Gamma$ , i.e.,

$$A(z, \bar{z}) \neq 0 \quad \forall z \in \Gamma. \quad (\text{A.41})$$

In the coordinates  $\{(z, p)\}$  on  $T^*\mathbb{R}^2$  the canonical symplectic structure  $\omega$  takes the form  $\omega = dp \wedge dz + d\bar{p} \wedge d\bar{z}$ . Hence,

$$\{H, I\} = (H_p I_z - H_z I_p) - (H_{\bar{p}} I_{\bar{z}} - H_{\bar{z}} I_{\bar{p}}) = 2\operatorname{Re}(H_p I_z - H_z I_p). \quad (\text{A.42})$$

As  $I$  is a first integral of the geodesic flow of  $g$ , we have

$$\{H, I\}|_V \equiv 0. \quad (\text{A.43})$$

Using (A.42) one sees that equation (A.43) is equivalent to the following system of equations

$$\begin{cases} A_{\bar{z}} = 0, \\ \lambda A_z + 2\lambda_z A + B\lambda_{\bar{z}} + \lambda B_{\bar{z}} = 0. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.44})$$

In particular, we see that the coefficient  $A(z, \bar{z})$  in front of  $p^3$  in the formula for the integral (A.40) is holomorphic in  $z \in V \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ ,  $A = A(z)$ . Take  $z_0$  in the interior of  $V$  and consider a biholomorphic change of the variable  $w = w(z)$  in an open neighborhood of  $z_0$  in the interior of  $V$ . Then the expression for the integral (A.40) implies that,

$$\tilde{A}(w) = A(z) \left( \frac{dw}{dz} \right)^2, \quad (\text{A.45})$$

where  $\tilde{A}(w)$  is the coefficient in front of  $(\tilde{p})^3$  in the expression for the integral  $I$  in the chart corresponding to  $w$ . Here  $\tilde{p}$  is the complex impulse in the chart corresponding to  $w$ .<sup>3</sup>

**Remark B.3** *In fact, (A.45) implies that the bivector field,*

$$\Omega_{\{z\}} := A(z) \partial_z \otimes \partial_z,$$

*when written in an isothermal atlas, will correspond to a globally defined holomorphic section of the bundle  $T_{\mathbb{C}}^{2,0}X \subseteq T_{\mathbb{C}}X$ . As the integral  $I$  is non-trivial (condition (b)), the holomorphic bivector  $\Omega$  vanishes only at finitely many points in the interior of  $X$ . If  $X$  were a closed surface, then by Hopf theorem,  $\deg(\Omega) = 2\chi(X)$ , where  $\chi(X) = 2 - 2g$  is the Euler characteristic of  $X$  and  $\deg(\Omega)$  is the number of zeros (counted with multiplicities) of  $\Omega$ . This would imply that  $g = 0, 1$ , and therefore  $X$  would be diffeomorphic to the 2-sphere or the 2-torus ([33, 34]).*

---

<sup>2</sup> $\bar{I} = I$  as  $I$  is real-valued.

<sup>3</sup>Note that  $p = \tilde{p} \frac{dw}{dz}$ .

Next, we want to simplify (A.44) by passing to a new complex variable  $w = w(z)$ , with  $w(z)$  holomorphic in the interior of  $V$ , so that  $\tilde{A}(w) \equiv 1$ . In view of (A.45), this amounts to solving the differential equation  $1 = A(z)(\frac{dw}{dz})^2$ . In the case when  $A(z_0) \neq 0$  and  $z_0$  lies in the interior of  $V$ , the later equation can be solved explicitly in a sufficiently small open disk centered at  $z_0$ ,

$$w(z) = w(z_0) + \int_{z_0}^z \frac{d\lambda}{\sqrt{A(\lambda)}},$$

where the path of integration connecting  $z_0$  with  $z$  is  $C^1$ -smooth and lies in the small disk centered at  $z_0$ . The square root  $\sqrt{A(\lambda)}$  is holomorphic in the considered disk and is defined up to the choice of the sign. As it was mentioned above, condition (b) of the theorem implies (A.41). Hence, by shrinking the strip  $V$  if necessary, we can ensure that  $\Gamma \subseteq V$  and  $A(z) \neq 0$  for any  $z \in V$ . Now, take  $z_0 \in \Gamma$  and consider the map,

$$\Phi : z \mapsto w(z) := \int_{z_0}^z \frac{d\lambda}{\sqrt{A(\lambda)}}, \quad V \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, \quad (\text{A.46})$$

where the path of integration connecting  $z_0$  with  $z$  is  $C^1$ -smooth and is contained in  $V$ . Clearly, the map  $\Phi$  above is well-defined on  $V$  and holomorphic in the interior of  $V$ . Moreover, it follows from (A.46) that the directional derivatives of  $\Phi$  of all orders exist and are continuous up to the boundary of  $V$ . This allows us to extend  $\Phi$  to a smooth map defined in some open set  $\tilde{V} \supseteq V$ . Next, let us consider the image  $\Phi(\Gamma)$  of the boundary  $\Gamma$ . Take  $z_1 \in \Gamma$ . By the inverse function theorem, there exist an open neighborhood  $U(z_1)$  of  $z_1$  in  $\mathbb{C}$  and an open neighborhood  $W(w_1)$  of  $w_1 := \Phi(z_1)$  in  $\mathbb{C}$  so that  $\Phi|_{U(z_1)} : U(z_1) \rightarrow W(w_1)$  is a diffeomorphism. Let  $w = u + iv$ . Then, as  $\tilde{A}(w) = 1$  for all  $w \in \Phi(V)$  we conclude from (A.39) and (A.40) that  $\tilde{g} := \Phi_*(g)$  and  $\tilde{I} := \Phi_*(I)$  are diagonal in the coordinates  $\{(u, v)\}$  on  $W(w_1) \cap \Phi(V)$  and non-proportional at all points of  $\Phi(V)$ . In other words, the coordinate vector fields  $\partial_v$  and  $\partial_u$  on  $W(w_1) \cap \Phi(V)$  coincide with the principle directions of the quadratic forms  $\tilde{g}$  and  $\tilde{I}$ . As by assumption the integral  $\tilde{I}$  is invariant with respect to the reflections at the boundary  $\Phi(\Gamma)$  we conclude that  $\Phi(\Gamma) \cap W(w_1)$  is a coordinate line. As  $z_1 \in \Gamma$  was chosen arbitrarily, we see that  $\Phi(\Gamma)$  is a straight line. By shrinking the strip  $V$  so that  $\Gamma \subseteq V$  once more if necessary and by rotating the target copy of  $\mathbb{C}$  we get that for some  $\delta > 0$ ,

$$\Phi(V) = \{w = u + iv \mid -\delta \leq v \leq 0\},$$

and  $\Phi : V \rightarrow \Phi(V)$  is a smooth covering map. The boundary  $\Phi(\Gamma)$  coincides with the real line. This proves that there exist a tubular neighborhood  $V$  of  $\Gamma$  in  $X$  and  $\delta, l > 0$  such that  $V$  is diffeomorphic to the cylinder

$$Z := \{z = x + iy \mid x \in \mathbb{R}/l\mathbb{Z}, -\delta \leq y \leq 0\},$$

with  $\Gamma$  corresponding to  $(\mathbb{R}/l\mathbb{Z}) \times \{0\}$ ,

$$H = 2p\bar{p}/\lambda, \quad I = p^2 + Bp\bar{p} + \bar{p}^2, \quad \bar{B} = B, \quad (\text{A.47})$$

and

$$B\lambda_{\bar{z}} + \lambda B_{\bar{z}} = -2\lambda_z. \quad (\text{A.48})$$

Note that (A.48) is equivalent to the vanishing of the Poisson bracket  $\{H, I\}$ . Equation (A.48) is also equivalent to  $(\lambda B)_{\bar{z}} = -2\lambda_z$ . By separating its real and the imaginary parts we get

$$\begin{cases} (\lambda B)_x = -2\lambda_x, \\ (\lambda B)_y = 2\lambda_y. \end{cases}$$

This implies that

$$\lambda(B+2) = (\lambda(B+2))|_{(y,0)} = q(y)/4, \quad \lambda(B-2) = (\lambda(B-2))|_{(0,x)} = f(x)/4$$

where  $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  is 1-periodic and  $q \in C^\infty([-\delta, 0])$ . By subtracting these two equations we see that,

$$\lambda(x, y) = q(y) - f(x) > 0.$$

This, together with (A.47) and  $p = (p_1 - ip_2)/2$  implies that

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \frac{p_1^2 + p_2^2}{q(y) - f(x)} \quad (\text{A.49})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} 2I &= (B+2)p_1^2 + (B-2)p_2^2 \\ &= \frac{q(y)p_1^2 + f(x)p_2^2}{q(y) - f(x)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.50})$$

**Remark B.4** *Our arguments also show that for any choice of functions  $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  1-periodic and  $q \in C^\infty([a, b])$ ,  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ , so that  $q(y) - f(x) > 0$  the functions  $H$  and  $I$  defined by (A.49) and (A.50) are in involution with respect to the canonical symplectic structure  $\omega = dp_1 \wedge dx + dp_2 \wedge dy$  on the cotangent bundle to the cylinder  $(\mathbb{R}/l\mathbb{Z}) \times [a, b]$ .*

This Remark allows us to extend the metric  $g$  and its first integral  $I$  to a larger cylinder,

$$\tilde{Z} := \{z = x + iy \mid x \in \mathbb{R}/l\mathbb{Z}, -\delta \leq y \leq \delta\},$$

that contains the boundary  $\Gamma = (\mathbb{R}/l\mathbb{Z}) \times \{0\}$  in its interior. In order to do this we extend the function  $q$  to a function  $q \in C^\infty[-\delta, \delta]$  so that  $q(y) - f(x) > 0$  on  $\tilde{Z}$  and

$$\forall k \geq 1, \quad q^{(k)}(\delta) = 0. \quad (\text{A.51})$$

Then we use (A.49) and (A.50) to extend the metric  $g$  and  $I$  to smooth quadratic forms on  $\tilde{Z}$ . By Remark B.4,  $I$  continues to be a quadratic integral of the Riemannian metric  $g$  on  $\tilde{Z}$ . In this way we extend the Riemannian manifold  $(X, g)$  to a smooth Riemannian manifold  $(\tilde{X}, \tilde{g})$  with connected boundary  $\tilde{\Gamma}$ , so that  $X \subseteq \tilde{X}$ ,  $\Gamma$  is in the interior of  $\tilde{X}$ ,  $\tilde{g}|_X = g$ ,  $\tilde{I}|_X = I$ , and  $\tilde{I}$  is a quadratic first integral of  $\tilde{g}$ . In addition, a collar neighborhood of  $\Gamma$  in  $\tilde{X}$  can be coordinatized by the cylinder  $\tilde{Z}$  so that the Legendre transforms of the metric and the integral are given by (A.49) and (A.50).

Our final step is to take two copies of  $(\tilde{X}, \tilde{g})$  and glue them along their boundaries by a diffeomorphism that, in the coordinates  $\{(x, y)\}$ , corresponds to the identity,

$$(x, \delta) \mapsto (x, \delta), \quad (\mathbb{R}/l\mathbb{Z}) \times \{\delta\} \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}/l\mathbb{Z}) \times \{\delta\}.$$

In this way we obtain a closed Riemannian manifold  $(\hat{X}, \hat{g})$ . In view of the flatness condition (A.51) on  $q$ , the metric  $\hat{g}$  and the corresponding quadratic form  $\hat{I}$  are smooth, the Riemannian manifold  $(X, g)$  is isometrically embedded into  $(\hat{X}, \hat{g})$ , and  $\hat{I}|_X = I$ . Moreover, by construction,  $\hat{I}$  is a quadratic integral of the geodesic flow of  $\hat{g}$ . Finally, Theorem 5 follows from the classification theorem for Liouville surfaces (see e.g. [33]).  $\square$

**Acknowledgments.** *Part of this work has been done at the Institute of Mathematics, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, and we would like to thank the colleagues there for the stimulating discussions.*

## References

- [1] Alexandrova, I. (2008). Semi-Classical Wavefront Set and Fourier Integral Operators, *Can. J. Math.* 60:241-263.
- [2] G. BIRKHOFF: *Dynamical systems*, Amer. Math. Soc. Colloq. Publ., **9**, AMS, New York, 1927
- [3] F. CARDOSO AND G. POPOV: *Quasimodes with exponentially small errors associated with elliptic periodic rays*, *Asymptot. Anal.*, **30**, no. 3-4, 217-247 (2002)
- [4] Y. COLIN DE VERDIÈRE: *Quasimodes sur les variétés Riemanniennes*, *Inventiones Math.*, **43**, 15-52 (1977)
- [5] Y. COLIN DE VERDIÈRE: *Spectre du Laplacien et longueurs des géodésiques périodiques I, II*, *Compositio Math.*, **27**, 80-106, 159-184 (1973)
- [6] Y. COLIN DE VERDIÈRE: *Spectrum of the Laplace operator and periodic geodesics: thirty years after. Festival Yves Colin de Verdière.*, *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* **57**, 2429-2463 (2007)
- [7] C. CROKE, V. SHARAFUTDINOV: *Spectral rigidity of a compact negatively curved manifold*, *Topology* **37**, 1265-1273 (1998).
- [8] M. DIMASSI AND J. SJÖSTRAND: *Spectral asymptotics in the semi-classical limit*. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series. 268. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [9] R. DOUADY: *Une démonstration directe de l'équivalence des théorèmes de tores invariants pour difféomorphismes et champs de vecteurs*. *C.R.Acad.Sci.Paris, Ser.A.* **295**, 201-204(1982)
- [10] J. DUISTERMAAT: *Oscillatory integrals, lagrange immersions and unfolding of singularities*, *Commun. in Pure and Appl. Math.*, **27**, 207-281 (1974)
- [11] J. DUISTERMAAT AND V. GUILLEMIN: *The spectrum of positive elliptic operators and periodic bicharacteristics*, *Invent. Math.*, **29**, 39-79 (1975)
- [12] T. GRAMTCHEV AND G. POPOV: *Nekhoroshev type estimates for billiard ball maps*. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* **45** no. 3, 859-895 (1995)

- [13] V. GUILLEMIN: *Wave trace invariants*, Duke Math. Journal, **83**, 287-352 (1996)
- [14] V. GUILLEMIN, D. KAZHDAN: *Some inverse spectral results for negatively curved 2-manifolds*, Topology **19**, 301-312 (1980).
- [15] V. GUILLEMIN AND R. MELROSE: *An inverse spectral result for elliptical regions in  $\mathbb{R}^2$* , Advances in Mathematics, **32**, 128-148 (1979)
- [16] V. GUILLEMIN AND R. MELROSE: *The Poisson summation formula for manifolds with boundary*, Advances in Mathematics, **32**, 204-232 (1979)
- [17] V. GUILLEMIN, T. PAUL AND A. URIBE: *"Bottom of the well" semi-classical wave trace invariants*, Math. Res. Lett., **14**, 711-719 (2007)
- [18] V. GUILLEMIN, A. URIBE: *Some inverse spectral results for semiclassical Schrödinger operators*, Math. Res. Lett., **14**, 623-632 (2007)
- [19] V. GUILLEMIN, S. STERNBERG: *Semi-classical analysis*. International Press, Boston, MA, 2013.
- [20] M. HERMAN: *Inégalités "a priori" pour des tores lagrangiens invariants par des difféomorphismes symplectiques*, Publ. Math. I.H.E.S., **70**, 47-101 (1989)
- [21] H. HEZARI AND S. ZELDITCH: *Inverse spectral problem for analytic  $(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^n$ -symmetric domains in  $\mathbb{R}^n$* , Geom. Funct. Anal., **20**, 160-191 (2010)
- [22] H. HEZARI AND S. ZELDITCH:  *$C^\infty$  spectral rigidity of the ellipse*, Anal. PDE **5** (2012), no. 5, 1105-1132.
- [23] F. HIRZEBRUCH: *Topological Methods in Algebraic Geometry*, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 1978
- [24] L. HÖRMANDER: *Fourier integral operators I*, Acta Math. **127**, 79-183 (1971)
- [25] L. HÖRMANDER: *The analysis of linear partial differential operators I-IV*, Springer-Verlag, 1983
- [26] L. HÖRMANDER: *An Introduction to complex analysis in several complex variables*, North-Holland, 1973
- [27] A. IANTCHENKO AND J. SJÖSTRAND: *Birkhoff normal forms for Fourier integral operators II*, Amer. J. Math, **124** (2002), 817-850
- [28] A. IANTCHENKO, J. SJÖSTRAND AND M. ZWORSKI: *Birkhoff normal forms in semi-classical inverse problems*, Math. Res. Lett., **9**, 337-362 (2002)
- [29] K.KIYOHARA: *Compact Liouville surfaces*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **43**(1991), 555-591
- [30] K.KIYOHARA: *Two Classes of Riemannian Manifolds Whose Geodesic Flows Are Integrable*, Memoirs of the AMS, Vol.**130**, Number 619(1997).
- [31] W. KLINGENBERG: *Lectures on closed geodesics*. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, Vol. 230. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1978.

- [32] S. KOBAYASHI: Differential geometry of complex vector bundles, Princeton University Press, 1987
- [33] V. Kolokoltsov, *Geodesic flows on two-dimensional manifolds with an additional first integral that is polynomial with respect to velocities*, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat., **46**(1982), no. 5, 994-1010
- [34] V. Kozlov, *Topological obstacles to the integrability of natural mechanical systems*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR, **249**(1979), no. 6, 1299-1302
- [35] S. KUKSIN: Analysis of Hamiltonian PDEs. Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications, 19. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2000
- [36] R. DE LA LLAVE, R. OBAYA: *Regularity of the composition operator in spaces of Hölder functions*, Discrete and continuous dynamical systems, **5**, 157-184 (1995)
- [37] V. LAZUTKIN: KAM theory and semiclassical approximations to eigenfunctions, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1993
- [38] A. MARTINEZ: An introduction to semiclassical and microlocal analysis, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2002.
- [39] S. MARVIZI, R. MELROSE: *Spectral invariants of convex planar regions*, J. Differ. Geom., **17**, 475-502 (1982)
- [40] E. MEINRENKEN: *Semiclassical principal symbols and Gutzwiller's trace formula*, Rep. Math. Phys. **31**, 279-295(1992).
- [41] R. MELROSE: *Equivalence of glancing hypersurfaces*, Inventiones Math., **37**, 165-191 (1976)
- [42] J. MOSER: *A rapidly convergent iteration method and non-linear partial differential equations I, II*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa **20**, 265-315, 499-535 (1966).
- [43] J. MOSER: *On the construction of almost periodic solutions for ordinary differential equations*, Proceedings of the International Conference on Functional Analysis and Related Topics, Tokyo, 1969, 60-67.
- [44] J. MOSER: *Proof of a generalized form of a fixed point theorem due to G.D. Birkhoff*. In: Palls, J., do Carmo, M. (eds) Geometry and Topology III. (Lect. Notes Math., vol. 597, pp. 464-494) Berlin Heidelberg New York: Springer 1977
- [45] G. PARERNAIN, M. SALO, G. UHLMANN: Spectral rigidity and invariant distributions on Anosov surfaces, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1208.4943>
- [46] J. PÖSCHEL: *Integrability of Hamiltonian systems on Cantor sets*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **35** (1982), 653-695
- [47] J. PÖSCHEL: A Lecture on the Classical KAM Theorem. *Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics* **69**, 707-732 (2001).

- [48] G. POPOV: *Quasimodes for the Laplace operator and glancing hypersurfaces*, Proceedings of the Conference on Microlocal Analysis and Nonlinear Waves, Ed. M. Beals, R. Melrose, J. Rauch, Springer Verlag, 1991
- [49] G. POPOV: *On the contribution of degenerate periodic trajectories to the wave-trace*, Commun. Math. Physics, **196**, 363-383 (1998)
- [50] G. POPOV: *Length spectrum invariants of Riemannian manifolds*, Math. Zeitschrift, **213**, 311-351 (1993)
- [51] G. POPOV: *Invariants of the length spectrum and spectral invariants for convex planar domains*, Commun. Math. Phys. **161**, 335-364 (1994)
- [52] G. POPOV: *KAM theorem for Gevrey hamiltonians*, Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems, **24**, 1753-1786 (2004)
- [53] G. POPOV, P. TOPALOV: *Liouville billiard tables and an inverse spectral result*, Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys., **23**, 225-248 (2003)
- [54] G. POPOV, P. TOPALOV: *Discrete analog of the projective equivalence and integrable billiard tables*, Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys., **28**, 1657-1684 (2008)
- [55] G. POPOV, P. TOPALOV: *On the integral geometry of Liouville billiard tables*, Commun. Math. Phys. **303**, 721-759 (2011)
- [56] G. POPOV, P. TOPALOV: *Invariants of isospectral deformations and spectral rigidity*, Communications in Partial Differential Equations, **37**, 369-446 (2012)
- [57] YU. SAFAROV, D. VASSILIEV: *The asymptotic distribution of eigenvalues of partial differential operators*. Translations of Mathematical Monographs, 155. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1997.
- [58] J. SJÖSTRAND, M. ZWORSKI: *Quantum monodromy and semi-classical trace formulae*, J. Math. Pure Appl., **81**, 1-33 (2002)
- [59] D. SALAMON: Salamon, Dietmar A. The Kolmogorov-Arnold-Moser theorem. Math. Phys. Electron. J. 10 (2004), Paper 3, 37 pp.
- [60] D. SALAMON, E. ZEHNDER: KAM theory in configuration space. Comment. Math. Helv. 64 (1989), no. 1, 84-132
- [61] K.F. Siburg: *The Principle of Least Action in Geometry and Dynamics*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics **1844**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg 2004(2004)
- [62] A. SORRENTINO: *Computing Mather's beta-function for Birkhoff billiards*, Discrete and Continuous Dyn. Systems Series A, **35** (10), 5055- 5082, (2015)
- [63] E. STEIN: *Singular Integrals and Differentiability Properties of Functions*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1970
- [64] S. TABACHNIKOV: *Billiards*, Panoramas et Syntheses, Societe Mathematique de France, 1995

- [65] E. ZEHNDER: Generalized implicit function theorems with applications to some small divisor problems. I. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **28** (1975), 91-140
- [66] S. ZELDITCH: *Wave invariants at elliptic closed geodesics*, *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, **7**, 1, 145-213(1997)
- [67] S. ZELDITCH: *Wave invariants for non-degenerate closed geodesics*, *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, **8**, 1, 179-217 (1998)
- [68] S. ZELDITCH: *Spectral determination of analytic bi-axisymmetric plane domains*, *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, **10**, 3, 628-677 (2000)
- [69] S. ZELDITCH: *Inverse spectral problem for analytic domains. I. Balian-Bloch trace formula*. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **248** (2004), no. 2, 357-407
- [70] S. ZELDITCH: *Inverse spectral problem for analytic domains. II.  $\mathbb{Z}/\mathbb{Z}_2$ -symmetric domains*. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, **170** (2009), no. 1, 205-269
- [71] S. ZELDITCH: *The inverse spectral problem*. *Surveys in Differential Geometry*, **IX**, 401-467 (2004)
- [72] M. ZWORSKI: *Semiclassical Analysis*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 138, AMS, 2012

G. P.: Université de Nantes,  
 Laboratoire de mathématiques Jean Leray, CNRS: UMR 6629,  
 2, rue de la Houssinière,  
 BP 92208, 44072 Nantes Cedex 03, France

P.T.: Department of Mathematics,  
 Northeastern University,  
 360 Huntington Avenue, Boston, MA 02115